



2000 Powell St., Suite 600
Emeryville, CA 94608, USA

www.scscertified.com

Brendan Grady

bgrady@scscertified.com

FOREST MANAGEMENT AND STUMP-TO-FOREST GATE CHAIN-OF-CUSTODY SURVEILLANCE EVALUATION REPORT

Ohio DNR-Division of Forestry

SCS-FM/COC-00130N

ODNR-Division of Forestry

2045 Morse Road, Bldg H-1

Columbus, Ohio 43229-6693

Chad.Sanders@dnr.state.oh.us

CERTIFIED	EXPIRATION
1/6/11	1/6/16

DATE OF FIELD AUDIT
09/21-23/11
DATE OF LAST UPDATE
04/23/12

Organization of the Report

This report of the results of our evaluation is divided into two sections. Section A provides the public summary and background information that is required by the Forest Stewardship Council. This section is made available to the general public and is intended to provide an overview of the evaluation process, the management programs and policies applied to the forest, and the results of the evaluation. Section A will be posted on the FSC Certificate Database (<http://info.fsc.org/>) no less than 30 days after issue of the certificate. Section B contains more detailed results and information for the use of by the FME.

FOREWORD

Cycle in annual surveillance audits			
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 1 st annual audit	<input type="checkbox"/> 2 nd annual audit	<input type="checkbox"/> 3 rd annual audit	<input type="checkbox"/> 4 th annual audit
Name of Forest Management Enterprise and abbreviation used in this report:			
Forest Management Enterprise (FME)	Ohio DNR – Division of Forestry (ODNR)		

All certificates issued by SCS under the aegis of the Forest Stewardship Council (FSC) require annual audits to ascertain ongoing compliance with the requirements and standards of certification. A public summary of the initial evaluation is available on the SCS website www.scscertified.com.

Pursuant to FSC and SCS guidelines, annual/surveillance audits are not intended to comprehensively examine the full scope of the certified forest operations, as the cost of a full-scope audit would be prohibitive and it is not mandated by FSC audit protocols. Rather, annual audits are comprised of three main components:

- A focused assessment of the status of any outstanding conditions or Corrective Action Requests (CARs; see discussion in section 5.0 for a summary those CARs and their disposition as a result of this annual audit in the separate CAR report file);
- Follow-up inquiry into any issues that may have arisen since the award of certification or prior to the audit; and
- As necessary given the breadth of coverage associated with the first two components, an additional focus on selected topics or issues, the selection of which is not known to the certificate holder prior to the audit.

All items marked with an asterisk (*) are not required for FMUs that qualify as single SLIMFs.

Contents

Section A – Public Summary	4
1.0 General Information	4
1.1 Annual Audit Team.....	4
1.2 Total time spent on evaluation	4
1.3 Standards Employed	5
2.0 Annual Audit Dates and Activities.....	5
2.1 Annual Audit Itinerary and Activities	5
3.0 Changes in Management Practices.....	7
4.0 Annual Summary of pesticide and other chemical use	8
5.0 Corrective Action Requests (CARs) and Observations (OBSs).....	8
6.0 Stakeholder Comment*	60
7.0 Certification Decision	61
Section B - Appendices.....	62
Appendix 1 – List of FMUs selected for evaluation (CONFIDENTIAL)	62
Appendix 2 – Evaluation of Management Systems (CONFIDENTIAL)*	62
Appendix 3 – Stakeholder analysis (CONFIDENTIAL)*	62
Appendix 4 – Additional Audit Techniques Employed (CONFIDENTIAL)*	63
Appendix 5 – Changes in Certification Scope	63
Appendix 6 – Pesticide derogations.....	63
Appendix 7 – Detailed observations (CONFIDENTIAL).....	63
Appendix 8 – Chain of Custody Indicators for FMEs (CONFIDENTIAL)	77

Section A – Public Summary

1.0 General Information

1.1 Annual Audit Team

Auditor Name:	Brendan Grady	Auditor role:	Lead Auditor
<p>Qualifications: Qualifications: Mr. Grady is the Program Manager for Forest Management Certification at SCS. Previously he served as a Certification Forester with SCS. In those roles, he has participated as a team member and leader in forest certification audits in the Western U.S. (California, Oregon, Washington, Idaho, Hawaii) and Europe (Sweden, Latvia, and Lithuania). Brendan has a B.S. in Forestry from the University of California, Berkeley, and a Juris Doctorate from the University of Washington School of Law. Brendan is a member of the State Bar of California, and was an attorney in private practice focusing on environmental law before returning to SCS.</p>			
Auditor Name:	Mike Ferrucci	Auditor role:	Team Auditor
<p>Qualifications: Mike Ferrucci is the SFI Program Manager for NSF – International Strategic Registrations and is responsible for all aspects of the firm’s SFI Certification programs. He is qualified as a RAB-QSA Lead Auditor (ISO 14001 Environmental Management Systems), as an SFI Lead Auditor for Forest Management, Procurement, and Chain of Custody, as an FSC Lead Auditor Forest Management and Chain of Custody, as a Tree Farm Group Certification Lead Auditor, and as a GHG Lead Auditor. Mike has led Sustainable Forest Initiative (SFI) certification and precertification reviews throughout the United States. He has also led or participated in joint SFI and Forest Stewardship Council (FSC) certification projects in nearly one dozen states and a joint scoping or precertification gap-analysis project on tribal lands throughout the United States. He also co-led the pioneering pilot dual evaluation of the Lakeview Stewardship Unit on the Fremont-Winema National Forest.</p> <p>Mike Ferrucci has 30 years of forest management experience. His expertise is in sustainable forest management planning; in certification of forests as sustainably managed; in the application of easements for large-scale working forests, and in the ecology, silviculture, and management of mixed species forests, with an emphasis on regeneration and management of native hardwood species. Mike has conducted or participated in assessments of forest management operations throughout the United States, with field experience in 4 countries and 30 states. Mike has been a member of the Society of American Foresters for over 30 years. Mike is also a Lecturer at the Yale School of Forestry and Environmental Studies, where he has taught graduate courses and workshops in forest management, operations, professional forest ethics, private forestry, and financial analysis.</p>			

1.2 Total time spent on evaluation

A. Number of days spent on-site assessing the applicant:	3
B. Number of auditors participating in on-site evaluation:	2
C. Additional days spent on preparation, stakeholder consultation, and post-site follow-up:	1

D. Total number of person days used in evaluation:	7
(Line D = (Total number of days in Line A x Total number of auditors from Line B) + additional days from Line C.	

1.3 Standards Employed

Box 1.3.1. – Applicable FSC-Accredited Standards		
Title	Version	Date of Finalization
FSC-US Forest Management Standard	1.0	July 2010
All standards employed are available on the websites of FSC International (www.fsc.org), the FSC-US (www.fscus.org) or the SCS Forest Conservation Program homepage (www.scscertified.com/forestry). Standards are also available, upon request, from Scientific Certification Systems (www.scscertified.com).		

2.0 Annual Audit Dates and Activities

2.1 Annual Audit Itinerary and Activities

Date: Wednesday September 21, 2011		
In Attendance	FMU/Location/ sites visited*	Activities/ notes
Brendan Grady, SCS		Opening meeting
Mike Ferrucci, NSF	Hocking State Forest: Hocking Compartment B-5:	Inventory and prescriptions, 282 acres, 8 management units, significant protection for wetlands, steep slopes, trails.
Chad Sanders - Land Management - North, ODOF		
Gregg Maxfield, Northern District Forest Manager, ODOF	Hocking State Forest: Hocking Timber Sale Contract 1005	Reviewed three completed “Cut Sections”: Cut Section 2 – Shelterwood, good oak regeneration, soils adequately stable and minimally affected; Cut Sections 1 and 3 – thinning
Mike Bowden, Fire Program Coordinator, ODOF	Hocking State Forest: Horse Trails	Close review of trail conditions, discussion of maintenance and of trail stabilization work including hardened trail sections; funding available from unit’s budgeted maintenance funds (limited) and through grant funds
Greg Guess, Southern District Land Management Coordinator, ODOF		
Aaron Klos, Fire Program/GIS, ODOF	Hocking State Forest: HockingA-3 Proposed Timber Sale	Modified by eliminating one of three proposed cut sections because it was adjacent to a HCVF (see next item) and botanist heard singing of rare Hermit
Nate Jester, District Forester – South		
Dan Balser, Assistant Chief, ODOF		

+ Two foresters at Hocking		thrush
	Hocking State Forest: Rhododendron Hollow HCVF	Hemlock-hardwood forest, with Appalachian oak nearby, hollow with stream
Date : Thursday September 22, 2011		
In Attendance	FMU/Location/ sites visited*	Activities/ notes
Brendan Grady, SCS Mike Ferrucci, NSF Chad Sanders - Land Management - North, ODOF Gregg Maxfield, Northern District Forest Manager, ODOF Mike Bowden, Fire Program Coordinator, ODOF Greg Guess, Southern District Land Management Coordinator, ODOF Nate Jester, District Forester – South Dan Balsler, Assistant Chief, ODOF Ron Collins, Forest Tech Christopher Kerr, Forest Tech	Vinton Furnace State Experimental Forest Beard Cemetery: Vinton Furnace State Experimental Forest Union Ridge:	Completed 19 acre deferment harvest; Cemetery adjacent; Low visibility, good aesthetics, BMPs. Active 44 acre deferment harvest; Interviewed Richard Hardin, Richard Hardin Logging. Harvest area design, road layout, and post-harvest stabilization all were excellent. Residual stem damage was observed on 40-50% of the residual trees in a deferment harvest; this damage was caused by log skidding or by tree felling and was at levels generally less than the current definition is 1/3 of tree circumference more than 2 feet tall but which involved exposed bark patches the size of a football or larger. Observed some small, low-quality Sawlogs included with pulpwood; current markets for low-quality logs are poor, and pulpwood markets are strong.
Danzil Walker, Forester – Zaleski Tom Shuman, Forest Manager – Zaleski Dan Yaussy, USFS Research, Delaware OH + ODOF Biologist Richard Hardin, Richard Hardin Logging	Zaleski State Forest: A-14 Zaleski State Forest: A-32 Zaleski State Forest Backpack Trail Zaleski State Forest Zaleski State Forest: E-11	Marked, not harvest; Cutting Section 3 (MU n) hardwood shelterwood with 40-60% retention Completed 87 acre thinning Observed trailhead parking area and sign Zaleski State Forest Shooting Range Completed 62-acre pine seed-tree harvest
Date : Friday September 22, 2011		
In Attendance	FMU/Location/ sites visited*	Activities/ notes

Brendan Grady, SCS Mike Ferrucci, NSF Chad Sanders - Land Management - North, ODOF	Shawnee State Forest: B10 B11	Inactive, Long Hollow McBride Run Active now. Mitigation for Rattlesnake. Retention Areas. Bridle Trail. Intermittent adjacent.
Gregg Maxfield, Northern District Forest Manager, ODOF	Shawnee State Forest: G22	Inactive, Rock Lick Hollow Inactive. Re-marked retention per policy. Intermittent adjacent
Greg Guess, Southern District Land Management Coordinator, ODOF	Shawnee State Forest: A29	Active Inactive. 2 loggers. 3 sections left. Trail Intermittent adjacent
Nate Jester, District Forester – South Dale Egbert, Forester J.D. Deemer – Law Enforcement, ODOF	Shawnee State Forest: B14	Active Active Now. Aesthetic considerations. Intermittent adjacent
Dan Balser, Assistant Chief, ODOF Chad Sanders - Land Management - North, ODOF		Closing Meeting
<i>Add more rows as necessary.</i>		

3.0 Changes in Management Practices

Along with a change in administration for the state of Ohio, ODNR underwent reorganization. The State Forester and ODNR Chief is now Robert Boyles, a career ODNR forester and formerly the Southern District Forest Manager. There were some other reassignments of duties amongst forestry staff that accompanied this change. Notably, Chad Sanders, who has primary responsibility for maintaining the ODNR Certification, had his duties expanded to include more direct field forestry. The audit team did not discover any issues where this reallocation has affected ODNR’s conformance to the standard.

The other major change is a planned increase in timber harvest. Over the past 10 years, ODNR has harvested only 20% of the annual growth and aims to increase that to 40% during 2012. Their ability to complete this goal depends on their operational ability to sell more timber. While this is an increase in harvest, harvesting is still far below the maximum threshold allowed by the standard.

4.0 Annual Summary of pesticide and other chemical use

Commercial name of pesticide/ herbicide	Active ingredient	Quantity applied annually (kg or lbs)	Size of area treated during previous year (ha or ac)	Reason for use
AGS203, Garlon	Triclopyr	128 gallons	1450	Invasive brush control
AGS 203, Arsenal	Imazapyr	20 gallons	500	Invasive brush control
Razor, Rodeo	Glyphosate	10 gallons	100	Herbaceous weed control
Pathway, Tordon	Picloram	8 gallons	150	Grapevine control

5.0 Corrective Action Requests (CARs) and Observations (OBSs)

5.1 Existing CARs from Previous Evaluations

Nonconformity: ODNR has not yet developed and begun to implement a program to annually monitor the status of specific HCV attributes including the effectiveness of the measures employed for their maintenance or enhancement.	
Major CAR 2010.1	Develop and document a procedure, including an implementation schedule, for annually monitoring the effectiveness of the measures employed to maintain or enhance high conservation values within delineated high conservation value forest areas.
Deadline	Prior to award of certification
Reference	FSC US National Standard, Criterion 9.4, Indicator 9.4.a
ODOF Response	<p>From a letter of November 10, 2010 to the SCS Lead Auditor, signed by Chad Saunders, Land Management Administrator, Division of Forestry:</p> <p>“In the time since our verification audit, the Division of Forestry has completed the following steps to address this nonconformity in order to be in conformance with indicator 9.4.a.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) The ODNR – Division of Forestry and Division of Wildlife have agreed to cooperate on annual monitoring efforts of HCV attributes on state forest designated High Conservation Value Forests. The Division of Wildlife has offered their in-house botanist to work in conjunction with the Division of Forestry’s in-house botanist, local foresters, and district managers to complete monitoring activities.

	<p>2) The Division of Forestry has updated Chapter 12 – Monitoring, of our Land Management Manual (attached) to describe the monitoring activities and the schedule of those activities.</p> <p>3) The Division of Forestry will revise its “Annual Work Plans” for each forest that contain HCVF to include a schedule of the HCVF’s that will be monitored in any given year.</p> <p>4) The Division of Forestry’s monitoring will also include a review of the zoning system and any proposed changes in the zones will be reviewed in order to further protect HCV attributes.”</p> <p>Chapter 12 of the Land Management Manual, revised and appended to the November 10th letter, was reviewed by the Lead Auditor and it was found that the additions to this Chapter do, indeed, implement the actions bulleted, above. The monitoring protocols, as now memorialized, constitute appropriate responses to National Indicator 9.4.a. In subsequent annual surveillance audits, the audit team will follow-up and confirm that the HCVF monitoring protocols are being properly implemented.</p>
Status	<p>Closed</p> <p>On the basis of the actions undertaken by ODOF in response to this Major CAR, we conclude that the non-conformity has now been adequately addressed, warranting closure of this Major CAR. Accordingly, this matter no longer constitutes a barrier to the award of certification.</p>

TO BE COMPLETED BY SCS REPRESENTATIVE	CAR/OBS Number (e.g. 1, 2, ...)		2010.1
	Select one: <input type="checkbox"/> Major CAR <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor CAR <input type="checkbox"/> Observation		
	FMU CAR/OBS issued to (when more than one FMU)		
	Deadline for Corrective Action by FME		
	<input type="checkbox"/> 3 months from above Date of Issuance <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Next audit (surveillance or re-evaluation) <input type="checkbox"/> Pre-condition to certification <input type="checkbox"/> Other deadline (specify):		
	Standard and Requirement Reference		FSC US National Indicator 4.4.b
NON-CONFORMITY <i>(or Background/ Justification in the case of Observations)</i> <i>(Describe and provide objective evidence)</i> <p>The manner and methods by which ODOF seeks and considers input in management planning from people who would likely be affected by management activities, while having been enhanced in the past year, is not yet resulting in an adequate level of satisfaction amongst stakeholders that their views are being appropriately solicited and considered. As a public agency, the adequacy of ODOF's stakeholder consultation procedures is in no small part reflected by overall level of citizen satisfaction in engaging in those procedures.</p>			
REQUESTED CORRECTIVE ACTION <i>(or Observation)</i> <p>Develop and implement more robust methods for seeking and considering stakeholder input as part of the management planning processes, both tactical (e.g., project planning) and strategic (e.g., statewide forest plans).</p>			

TO BE COMPLETED BY FME	<p>IMPLEMENTED CORRECTIVE ACTION <i>(Response to Observations is optional)</i></p> <p>Describe action taken by the FME to address the root cause of the non-conformity</p> <p>Beginning in January 2011, the Division of Forestry has enhanced our public input and consultation activities. The enhancements to our stakeholder input process are detailed below. In the past year, two new DOF initiatives were rolled out for stakeholder input 1)APV area expansions at Fernwood and Maumee and 2)incremental increase of annual harvest levels to 40% of annual growth.</p> <p><u>Meetings with the Chief</u> – Chief Boyles has held several direct meeting with stakeholder groups in an effort to enhance input and consultation. The groups included: The Ohio Horsemen’s Council, The Toledo Trail Riders, the Buckeye Forest Council, Ohio Environmental Council, Ohio Forestry Association, Sierra Club, ATV groups in Jefferson County, The Nature Conservancy, NWTF, USFS, OSU Extension, etc. Meetings were proactive on DOF’s part with the intent of getting additional consultation and foster communications with stakeholder groups.</p> <p><u>Enhanced Open House</u> – This year’s round of open houses featured a presentation on the highlights of the changes to our management and our plans. The balance of the open house time was designed to present our site-specific activities for the coming year. This is a new effort. Historically open houses were simple public meetings where citizens can ask questions regarding activities. In order to satisfy stakeholders a presentation was held where activities were explained, new efforts were discussed, and questions were received. As normal, written comments were solicited and comment sheets were provided. A follow-up meeting was held with 3 environmental groups to further clarify our management directions and new efforts.</p> <p><u>Other Enhancements</u> – Chief Boyles has proactively engaged the Forest Advisory Council by discussed management direction and new initiatives for their council. Several enhancements were made to our website that give the public better information, more information, and an opportunity to comment. All parties who provided written comment to our open houses were sent a response letter from the Division.</p>	
	<p>EVIDENCE OF CONFORMANCE SUBMITTED WITH THIS FORM <i>(please list)</i></p> <p>List of direct meetings with the Chief Open House powerpoints Summary of Website changes FAC meetings Written stakeholder comments, 2011 Response Letters, 2011</p>	
	<p>FME Representative Name and Title</p> <p>Chad Sanders, Land Management Administrator</p>	<p>091911</p>
	<p>SCS REVIEW / ACCEPTANCE OF CORRECTIVE ACTION <i>(Describe conclusion in detail)</i></p>	
TO BE COMPLETED BY SCS		

Based on the proactive steps taken by ODNR described above to more actively engage with stakeholders, this CAR has been closed.

- CLOSED
- UPGRADED TO MAJOR
- OTHER DECISION (refer to description above)

SCS Representative Name and Title (CAR/OBS reviewer)	Date of Acceptance of Corrective Action
Brendan Grady	9/23/11

Press Enter twice below table to leave a space, then copy and paste table below for each CAR/OBS

TO BE COMPLETED BY SCS REPRESENTATIVE	CAR/OBS Number (e.g. 1, 2, ...)		2010.2	
	Select one: <input type="checkbox"/> Major CAR <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor CAR <input type="checkbox"/> Observation			
	Site CAR/OBS issued to (where more than one site)			
	Deadline for Corrective Action by FME			
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 3 months from above Date of Issuance <input type="checkbox"/> Next audit (surveillance or re-evaluation) <input type="checkbox"/> Pre-condition to certification <input type="checkbox"/> Other deadline (specify):			
	Standard and Requirement Reference		FSC US National Indicator 4.5.b	
NON-CONFORMITY (or Background/ Justification in the case of Observations) (Describe and provide objective evidence) The availability of the ODNR's dispute resolution mechanism is not adequately known and, as such, is not adequately accessible to interested stakeholders wishing to voice grievances and have them resolved.				
REQUESTED CORRECTIVE ACTION (or Observation) Take actions to make widely known and accessible the Department's dispute resolution mechanism.				

TO BE COMPLETED BY FME

IMPLEMENTED CORRECTIVE ACTION (*Response to Observations is optional*)

Describe action taken by the FME to address the root cause of the non-conformity

Ohio DOF has moved the Dispute Resolution to a higher location on our website and therefore it is more conspicuous for public viewing. Forest Managers are actively offering the Dispute Resolution form to interested person. This CAR was closed via email from Dr. Hrubes 4/6/2011

From: Robert Hrubes [mailto:RHrubes@scscertified.com]

Sent: Wednesday, April 06, 2011 6:23 PM

To: Sanders, Chad

Cc: mferrucci@iforest.com; Boyles, Bob; Brendan Grady; Amy Hsu

Subject: RE: Ohio FSC CAR's due 3 months after award

Hey Chad:

Thanks for the timely responses to the 2 Minor CARs. I have reviewed the Division's responses to these two CARs and I find the actions taken to be sufficient to warrant their closure, which I will ask staff to do, forthwith.

I do have one follow-up question for additional information that would reinforce the closure of CAR 2010.2:

- Could you provide any evidence that forest managers are more actively offering the dispute resolution form to interested parties? For instance, is there any email correspondence or similar direction/guidance from you to the forest managers encouraging them to do so?

On an largely unrelated matter, I notice that the FSC certificate posted on your website is unsigned. I am conjecturing that you have posted the draft certificate that we sent to you for review. We subsequently sent you hard copies of the signed/fully executed certificate. It is that version that needs to be posted on your website. You can either scan one of the hard copies in your possession or we can do it for you. Just let me know.

Regards,

Robert J. Hrubes, Ph.D.

Senior Vice-President

Scientific Certification Systems

2000 Powell Street, Suite 600

Emeryville, CA 94608

Phone: (510) 452-8007

Cell: (510) 913-0696

EVIDENCE OF CONFORMANCE SUBMITTED WITH THIS FORM (*please list*)

	http://ohiodnr.com/Home/forests/StateForestsRecreation/tabid/5622/Default.aspx The Dispute Resolution process is in the left menu bar.	
	FME Representative Name and Title	Date
TO BE COMPLETED BY SCS REPRESENTATIVE	<p>SCS REVIEW / ACCEPTANCE OF CORRECTIVE ACTION <i>(Describe conclusion in detail)</i></p> <p>At the 2011 audit, the team confirmed that the described changes had been.</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> CLOSED <input type="checkbox"/> UPGRADED TO MAJOR <input type="checkbox"/> OTHER DECISION (refer to description above)</p>	
	SCS Representative Name and Title (CAR/OBS reviewer) Robert Hrubes	Date of Acceptance of Corrective Action 4/6/11
<i>Press Enter twice below table to leave a space, then copy and paste table below for each CAR/OBS</i>		

TO BE COMPLETED BY SCS REPRESENTATIVE	CAR/OBS Number (e.g. 1, 2, ...)		2010.3
	Select one: <input type="checkbox"/> Major CAR <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor CAR <input type="checkbox"/> Observation		
	Site CAR/OBS issued to (where more than one site)		
	Deadline for Corrective Action by FME		
	<input type="checkbox"/> 3months from above Date of Issuance <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Nex audit (surveillance or re-evaluation) <input type="checkbox"/> Pre-condition to certification <input type="checkbox"/> Other deadline (specify):		
	Standard and Requirement Reference		FSC US National Indicator 6.2.c
NON-CONFORMITY (or Background/ Justification in the case of Observations) (Describe and provide objective evidence) There is insufficient evidence that management plans and operations on the Ohio State Forests are designed to meet landscape-level biodiversity conservation goals.			
REQUESTED CORRECTIVE ACTION (or Observation) Review, revise and better document, as appropriate, management planning and operations so as to better meet landscape-level biodiversity conservation goals			

TO BE COMPLETED BY FME	IMPLEMENTED CORRECTIVE ACTION <i>(Response to Observations is optional)</i> Describe action taken by the FME to address the root cause of the non-conformity All plans were revised to include a section listing our landscape level biodiversity conservation goals. These biodiversity goals were developed during the FRAS (2010 Forest Resource Assessment and Strategies) effort and have been vetted with the public and stakeholders. Several public meetings and stakeholder input influenced the development of the FRAS goals. DOF has adopted the biodiversity goals from the FRAS effort as our "Desired Future Condition" and inserted these goals into our 5-year management plans. Further, our 2010 Desired Future Condition document was revised to reflect these changes.	
	EVIDENCE OF CONFORMANCE SUBMITTED WITH THIS FORM <i>(please list)</i> FRAS Biodiversity plan subsection. Management Plan revision and / or summary of plan revisions. Desire Future Condition	
	FME Representative Name and Title	Date
TO BE COMPLETED BY SCS REPRESENTATIVE	SCS REVIEW / ACCEPTANCE OF CORRECTIVE ACTION <i>(Describe conclusion in detail)</i> Through the FRAS process, ODNR identified 3 primary landscape level biodiversity conservation goals: Promote regeneration of Oak-hickory forest, Protect unique or rare forest plant species and biological communities, maintain habitat for a diversity of forest-associated wildlife. In general, the biodiversity goals are aimed at increasing areas of early successional and late successional forest habitat, as most of the forest landscape of Ohio is at a similar mid-successional state. Based on these plan updates and the other actions described above, this CAR is closed. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> CLOSED <input type="checkbox"/> UPGRADED TO MAJOR <input type="checkbox"/> OTHER DECISION <i>(refer to description above)</i>	
	SCS Representative Name and Title <i>(CAR/OBS reviewer)</i> Brendan Grady	Date of Acceptance of Corrective Action 9/23/11
Press Enter twice below table to leave a space, then copy and paste table below for each CAR/OBS		

TO BE COMPLETED BY SCS REPRESENTATIVE	CAR/OBS Number (e.g. 1, 2, ...)		2010.4
	Select one: <input type="checkbox"/> Major CAR <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor CAR <input type="checkbox"/> Observation		
	Site CAR/OBS issued to (where more than one site)		
	Deadline for Corrective Action by FME		
	<input type="checkbox"/> 3 months from above Date of Issuance <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Next audit (surveillance or reevaluation) <input type="checkbox"/> Pre-condition to certification <input type="checkbox"/> Other deadline (specify):		
	Standard and Requirement Reference		FSC US National Standard, Indicator 6.3.f
NON-CONFORMITY (or Background/ Justification in the case of Observations) <i>(Describe and provide objective evidence)</i> There is inadequate coordination between the Division of Forestry and the Division of Wildlife regarding the "Guidelines for Management of Forestland Habitats." There is a lack of clarity as to the intent of the Guidelines and references to the Guidelines in the Manual appear to be overstated.			
REQUESTED CORRECTIVE ACTION (or Observation) Develop improved modes of coordination with the Division of Wildlife regarding the "Guidelines for Management of Forestland Habitats" and clarify the manner in which these Guidelines will be employed in the field.			

TO BE COMPLETED BY FME	IMPLEMENTED CORRECTIVE ACTION <i>(Response to Observations is optional)</i> Describe action taken by the FME to address the root cause of the non-conformity DOF and DOW coordinated on revising two sections of the Land Management Manual. 1) Chapter 4 – Timber Harvest Prep. This chapter was revised to include an update retention policy that reconciles three department-level guidelines on retention trees; and 2) Chapter 5 – Wildlife Management. This chapter was revised to reflect current policies and to establish better direction on wildlife habitat management. Both chapters are included as evidence. Further, DOF foresters were trained on the updates. As a side note, DOW is dissatisfied with the shortcomings of their document “Guidelines for Management of Forestland Habitats” and they are currently revising this document for both Division’s benefit.	
	EVIDENCE OF CONFORMANCE SUBMITTED WITH THIS FORM <i>(please list)</i> LM Manual chapters 4 and 5. Supporting guidelines from DOW and associated emails	
	FME Representative Name and Title	Date
TO BE COMPLETED BY SCS REPRESENTATIVE	SCS REVIEW / ACCEPTANCE OF CORRECTIVE ACTION <i>(Describe conclusion in detail)</i> The documents submitted by ODNR show increasing collaboration between DOF and DOW on how to classify legacy trees and other features warranting in-stand retention and protection. While these procedures are admittedly will be reviewed again for better use in the field, the current procedures adequately address the open non-conformance. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> CLOSED <input type="checkbox"/> UPGRADED TO MAJOR <input type="checkbox"/> OTHER DECISION <i>(refer to description above)</i>	
	SCS Representative Name and Title <i>(CAR/OBS reviewer)</i> Brendan Grady	Date of Acceptance of Corrective Action 9/23/11
Press Enter twice below table to leave a space, then copy and paste table below for each CAR/OBS		

TO BE COMPLETED BY SCS REPRESENTATIVE	CAR/OBS Number (e.g. 1, 2, ...)		2010.5
	Select one: <input type="checkbox"/> Major CAR <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor CAR <input type="checkbox"/> Observation		
	Site CAR/OBS issued to (where more than one site)		
	Deadline for Corrective Action by FME		
	<input type="checkbox"/> 3 months from above Date of Issuance <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Next audit (surveillance or re-evaluation) <input type="checkbox"/> Pre-condition to certification <input type="checkbox"/> Other deadline (specify):		
	Standard and Requirement Reference		FSC US National Indicator 6.5.d
NON-CONFORMITY (or Background/ Justification in the case of Observations) (Describe and provide objective evidence) The Blackburn Ridge road does not meet the Department's best management practices and, by extension, the FSC requirement that the road system is maintained to reduce short and long-term environmental impacts.			
REQUESTED CORRECTIVE ACTION (or Observation) Correct the situation on the Blackburn Ridge road and confirm and document that this is an isolated incident; if other situations exist of inadequate compliance with the Ohio BMPs, take appropriate actions with documentation that will provide evidence to SCS so as to assure full compliance with road related BMPs.			

TO BE COMPLETED BY FME	IMPLEMENTED CORRECTIVE ACTION <i>(Response to Observations is optional)</i> Describe action taken by the FME to address the root cause of the non-conformity Blackburn Ridge road is a limited use road, which is not often visited or used. In the winter of 2010, DOF staff addressed all the BMP issues on Blackburn Ridge Road by re-grading and draining the road. Pictures are available. Further, a limited-use road inspection / maintenance procedure is included in the manual and work plans. This new procedure ensures that DOF has a program to minimize both short- and long-term environmental impacts from limited use roads.	
	EVIDENCE OF CONFORMANCE SUBMITTED WITH THIS FORM <i>(please list)</i> Photos and documentation of Blackburn Ridge Road rehab. Limited-use road inspection and procedure	
	FME Representative Name and Title	Date
TO BE COMPLETED BY SCS REPRESENTATIVE	SCS REVIEW / ACCEPTANCE OF CORRECTIVE ACTION <i>(Describe conclusion in detail)</i> The audit team reviewed in person the repair efforts at Blackburn ridge road. The road repairs were adequate to address the immediate erosion problem, although the general layout of the road means that further monitoring of it will be required. To address these ongoing issues, ODNR developed a new plan for inventorying their road system (the limited-use road procedure and inspection form), which will provide better information on road engineering issues at a systems level, prioritize areas for repair, and put mitigation plans in place.	
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> CLOSED <input type="checkbox"/> UPGRADED TO MAJOR <input type="checkbox"/> OTHER DECISION <i>(refer to description above)</i>	
	SCS Representative Name and Title <i>(CAR/OBS reviewer)</i> Brendan Grady	Date of Acceptance of Corrective Action 9/23/11
Press Enter twice below table to leave a space, then copy and paste table below for each CAR/OBS		

TO BE COMPLETED BY SCS REPRESENTATIVE	CAR/OBS Number (e.g. 1, 2, ...)		2010.6
	Select one: <input type="checkbox"/> Major CAR <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor CAR <input type="checkbox"/> Observation		
	Site CAR/OBS issued to (where more than one site)		
	Deadline for Corrective Action by FME		
	<input type="checkbox"/> 3 months from above Date of Issuance <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Next audit (surveillance or re-evaluation) <input type="checkbox"/> Pre-condition to certification <input type="checkbox"/> Other deadline (specify):		
Standard and Requirement Reference		FSC US National Indicator 7.1.p	
NON-CONFORMITY (or Background/ Justification in the case of Observations) <i>(Describe and provide objective evidence)</i> Management plans do not adequately describe and justify the types and sizes of harvesting machinery and harvesting techniques employed on the FMU.			
REQUESTED CORRECTIVE ACTION (or Observation) Incorporate into the body of documents constituting the management plan for the Ohio State Forests (e.g., the property specific management plans) a description and justification for the types and sizes of harvesting machinery and harvesting techniques that are used.			

TO BE COMPLETED BY FME	IMPLEMENTED CORRECTIVE ACTION <i>(Response to Observations is optional)</i> Describe action taken by the FME to address the root cause of the non-conformity Language addressing the types and sizes of harvesting machinery is an important part of our timber sale contracts. However, comparable language was not in our management plan. A description and justification for the types and sized of harvesting machinery and techniques is included in each of the 5-year management plans.	
	EVIDENCE OF CONFORMANCE SUBMITTED WITH THIS FORM <i>(please list)</i> Summary of plan changes document	
	FME Representative Name and Title	Date
TO BE COMPLETED BY SCS REPRESENTATIVE	SCS REVIEW / ACCEPTANCE OF CORRECTIVE ACTION <i>(Describe conclusion in detail)</i> A review of the sample of the five year management plans prepared for each 5-year forest confirmed that there is a section that describes harvesting equipment (Beaver Creek and Zaleski).	
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> CLOSED <input type="checkbox"/> UPGRADED TO MAJOR <input type="checkbox"/> OTHER DECISION (refer to description above)	
	SCS Representative Name and Title (CAR/OBS reviewer) Brendan Grady	Date of Acceptance of Corrective Action 9/23/11
Press Enter twice below table to leave a space, then copy and paste table below for each CAR/OBS		

TO BE COMPLETED BY SCS REPRESENTATIVE	CAR/OBS Number (e.g. 1, 2, ...)		2010.7
	Select one: <input type="checkbox"/> Major CAR <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor CAR <input type="checkbox"/> Observation		
	Site CAR/OBS issued to (where more than one site)		
	Deadline for Corrective Action by FME		
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 3 months from above Date of Issuance <input type="checkbox"/> Next audit (surveillance or re-evaluation) <input type="checkbox"/> Pre-condition to certification <input type="checkbox"/> Other deadline (specify):		
	Standard and Requirement Reference		FSC US National Indicator 7.4.b
NON-CONFORMITY (or Background/ Justification in the case of Observations) (Describe and provide objective evidence) The Land Management Manual is not easily accessible to the public, thus constituting a non-conformance with the FSC requirement that managers of public forests make draft management plans, revisions and supporting documentation easily accessible for public review and comment.			
REQUESTED CORRECTIVE ACTION (or Observation) Make the Land Management Manual easily accessible to the public.			

TO BE COMPLETED BY FME	IMPLEMENTED CORRECTIVE ACTION <i>(Response to Observations is optional)</i> Describe action taken by the FME to address the root cause of the non-conformity Ohio DOF has posted the latest version of the Land Management Manual on our public website along with other certification reports and documents. This CAR was closed by Dr. Hrubes on 4/6/11. See email on CAR 2010.2.	
	EVIDENCE OF CONFORMANCE SUBMITTED WITH THIS FORM <i>(please list)</i> http://ohiodnr.com/Default.aspx?tabid=22816 The manual is posted at the bottom of the page	
	FME Representative Name and Title	Date
TO BE COMPLETED BY SCS REPRESENTATIVE	SCS REVIEW / ACCEPTANCE OF CORRECTIVE ACTION <i>(Describe conclusion in detail)</i> Already closed previously	
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> CLOSED <input type="checkbox"/> UPGRADED TO MAJOR <input type="checkbox"/> OTHER DECISION <i>(refer to description above)</i>	
	SCS Representative Name and Title (CAR/OBS reviewer) Robert Hrubes	Date of Acceptance of Corrective Action 4/6/11
Press Enter twice below table to leave a space, then copy and paste table below for each CAR/OBS		

TO BE COMPLETED BY SCS REPRESENTATIVE	CAR/OBS Number (e.g. 1, 2, ...)		2010.8
	Select one: <input type="checkbox"/> Major CAR <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor CAR <input type="checkbox"/> Observation		
	Site CAR/OBS issued to (where more than one site)		
	Deadline for Corrective Action by FME		
	<input type="checkbox"/> 3 months from above Date of Issuance <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Next audit (surveillance or re-evaluation) <input type="checkbox"/> Pre-condition to certification <input type="checkbox"/> Other deadline (specify):		
	Standard and Requirement Reference		FSC US National Indicators 8.2.d.1
NON-CONFORMITY (or Background/ Justification in the case of Observations) (Describe and provide objective evidence) ODOF is not adequately engaging in post-treatment monitoring of prescribed fire prescriptions to ensure that they are properly implemented, that any possible adverse environmental impacts are identified and minimized, and that the prescriptions are effective in achieving the desired outcomes.			
REQUESTED CORRECTIVE ACTION (or Observation) With input from the scientific community, design and implement improved and more structured post-treatment evaluation procedures for assessing the effectiveness of prescribed fire treatments in achieving desired forest cover conditions.			

TO BE COMPLETED BY FME	IMPLEMENTED CORRECTIVE ACTION <i>(Response to Observations is optional)</i> Describe action taken by the FME to address the root cause of the non-conformity DOF has adopted a post-treatment monitoring procedure of prescribed fire. This procedure is outlined in Chapter 12-Monitoring of the LM Manual. Post-fire monitoring will utilize the protocol outlined in the SILVAH Oak program and is discussed in the USFS NTR-33. Monitoring plots are nested plots consisting of a regeneration plot, an interference plot, and an overstory plot (if necessary). This procedure was developed with consultation from scientific community (USFS Delaware Research Lab). Post-fire monitoring will occur between 3-5 years post-treatment. At least 1 or more burn units were evaluated using new procedure. Results of post-fire monitoring will be included in the annual management review and in the publicly available summary of monitoring efforts. DOF is currently procuring services to conduct this monitoring from a third-party contractor. The intent is to use this individual to complete the fire monitoring duties each year.	
	EVIDENCE OF CONFORMANCE SUBMITTED WITH THIS FORM <i>(please list)</i> Chapter 12-Monitoring LM Manual SILVAH Oak Personal Services Agreement with Dave Minney.	
	FME Representative Name and Title	Date
TO BE COMPLETED BY SCS REPRESENTATIVE	SCS REVIEW / ACCEPTANCE OF CORRECTIVE ACTION <i>(Describe conclusion in detail)</i> A new monitoring procedure was designed in response to this CAR, including input from outside scientists. Pre-fire monitoring is accomplished as part of the normal timber inventory. Post-fire monitoring is 3-5 years after and considers overstory/mid/understory tree composition, with the aim to enhance oak regeneration. Also covered in the monitoring are any rte species on the site and the presence of invasives. Since this is a new program, monitoring data was not reviewed by the audit team, but should be done in future surveillance audits.	
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> CLOSED <input type="checkbox"/> UPGRADED TO MAJOR <input type="checkbox"/> OTHER DECISION <i>(refer to description above)</i>	
SCS Representative Name and Title <i>(CAR/OBS reviewer)</i> Brendan Grady	Date of Acceptance of Corrective Action 9/23/11	
Press Enter twice below table to leave a space, then copy and paste table below for each CAR/OBS		

TO BE COMPLETED BY SCS REPRESENTATIVE	CAR/OBS Number (e.g. 1, 2, ...) 2010.9	
	Select one: <input type="checkbox"/> Major CAR <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor CAR <input type="checkbox"/> Observation	
	Site CAR/OBS issued to (where more than one site)	
	Deadline for Corrective Action by FME <input type="checkbox"/> 3 months from above Date of Issuance <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Next audit (surveillance or re-evaluation) <input type="checkbox"/> Pre-condition to certification <input type="checkbox"/> Other deadline (specify):	
	Standard and Requirement Reference	FSC US National Indicator 8.2.d.2
NON-CONFORMITY (or Background/ Justification in the case of Observations) <i>(Describe and provide objective evidence)</i> Road system monitoring procedures are not being consistently implemented in the field.		
REQUESTED CORRECTIVE ACTION (or Observation) Take actions that will assure a higher and more consistent level of implementation of the road system monitoring procedures.		

TO BE COMPLETED BY FME	IMPLEMENTED CORRECTIVE ACTION <i>(Response to Observations is optional)</i> Describe action taken by the FME to address the root cause of the non-conformity A Road inspection procedure was formulated and is included in Chapter 12-Monitoring of the Land Management Manual. Staff have been trained on the updated procedure. A schedule of limited-use monitoring is included in each state forest's work plans for 2012. Several inspections have been completed and are available for review.	
	EVIDENCE OF CONFORMANCE SUBMITTED WITH THIS FORM <i>(please list)</i> Chapter 12-Monitoring of the Land Management Manual Limited-use road inspection form Completed inspections	
	FME Representative Name and Title	Date
TO BE COMPLETED BY SCS REPRESENTATIVE	SCS REVIEW / ACCEPTANCE OF CORRECTIVE ACTION <i>(Describe conclusion in detail)</i> The new road use procedures and inspection forms were reviewed. The forms are to be used on the limited use roads found in the state forests, such as bridle trails, timber hauling roads, and other roads not open for public use. Based on this, and a review of a completed inspection form, this CAR is closed.	
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> CLOSED <input type="checkbox"/> UPGRADED TO MAJOR <input type="checkbox"/> OTHER DECISION <i>(refer to description above)</i>	
SCS Representative Name and Title <i>(CAR/OBS reviewer)</i> Brendan Grady	Date of Acceptance of Corrective Action 9/23/11	
Press Enter twice below table to leave a space, then copy and paste table below for each CAR/OBS		

TO BE COMPLETED BY SCS REPRESENTATIVE	CAR/OBS Number (e.g. 1, 2, ...)		2010.10
	Select one: <input type="checkbox"/> Major CAR <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor CAR <input type="checkbox"/> Observation		
	Site CAR/OBS issued to (where more than one site)		
	Deadline for Corrective Action by FME <input type="checkbox"/> 3 months from above Date of Issuance <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Next audit (surveillance r re-evaluation) <input type="checkbox"/> Pre-condition to certification <input type="checkbox"/> Other deadline (specify):		
	Standard and Requirement Reference		FSC US National Indicator 9.1.c
NON-CONFORMITY (or Background/ Justification in the case of Observations) (Describe and provide objective evidence) A summary of the assessment of results for identifying areas possessing high conservation values and the management strategies employed for maintaining or enhancing those values is not readily available to the public.			
REQUESTED CORRECTIVE ACTION (or Observation) Prepare and make readily available to the public a summary of the assessment results for identifying areas possessing high conservation values and the management strategies employed for maintaining or enhancing those values			

TO BE COMPLETED BY FME	IMPLEMENTED CORRECTIVE ACTION <i>(Response to Observations is optional)</i> Describe action taken by the FME to address the root cause of the non-conformity The HCVF Assessment based on the FSC protocol for assessing HCVF that the DOF completed this assessment in 2010 is posted the entire document on our website. HCVF is discussed on our open houses and monitoring of HCVF has begun in the summer of 2011. Maumee State Forest has been particularly proactive in managing their HCVF areas by securing a grant for restoration of HCVF from the "Great Lakes Restoration Initiative". Further the publicly available summary of monitoring results is also completed for 2010 and available on our website.	
	EVIDENCE OF CONFORMANCE SUBMITTED WITH THIS FORM <i>(please list)</i> HCVF Assessment on the "certification" page on DOF website. GLRI grant for Maumee State Forest	
	FME Representative Name and Title	Date
TO BE COMPLETED BY SCS REPRESENTATIVE	SCS REVIEW / ACCEPTANCE OF CORRECTIVE ACTION <i>(Describe conclusion in detail)</i> The audit team confirmed that the HCVF assessment document was available on the ODNR website, describing the process for analyzing HCVF and the results of the analysis.	
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> CLOSED <input type="checkbox"/> UPGRADED TO MAJOR <input type="checkbox"/> OTHER DECISION <i>(refer to description above)</i>	
	SCS Representative Name and Title <i>(CAR/OBS reviewer)</i> Brendan Grady	Date of Acceptance of Corrective Action 9/23/11
Press Enter twice below table to leave a space, then copy and paste table below for each CAR/OBS		

TO BE COMPLETED BY SCS REPRESENTATIVE	CAR/OBS Number (e.g. 1, 2, ...)		2010.11
	Select one: <input type="checkbox"/> Major CAR <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor CAR <input type="checkbox"/> Observation		
	Site CAR/OBS issued to (where more than one site)		
	Deadline for Corrective Action by FME		
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 3 months from above Date of Issuance <input type="checkbox"/> Next audit (surveillance or re-evaluation) <input type="checkbox"/> Pre-condition to certification <input type="checkbox"/> Other deadline (specify):		
Standard and Requirement Reference		FSC US National Indicator 8.3.a	
NON-CONFORMITY (or Background/ Justification in the case of Observations) (Describe and provide objective evidence) The chain-of-custody procedures prepared for the audit were adequate to cover merchandizing log yards, but did not properly address stumpage sales.			
REQUESTED CORRECTIVE ACTION (or Observation) Extend the stump to gate chain-of-custody procedures to cover stumpage sales			

TO BE COMPLETED BY FME

IMPLEMENTED CORRECTIVE ACTION *(Response to Observations is optional)*

Describe action taken by the FME to address the root cause of the non-conformity

DOF updated Chapter 12 of the Land Management Manual to include stump-to-gate chain-of-custody procedures for stumpage timber sales. Further, all stumpage sale purchasers with existing contracts were notified with a letter that noted our certification status with instructions to contact Chad Sanders for information on CoC procedures. Finally, our stumpage timber sale agreement (contract) was updated to include CoC procedures to stumpage sales. The evidence documents with certification statements were reviewed/approved by SCS (Rachel Lem) prior to use by DOF. Sent to SCS Dr. Hrubes on 4/12/11 via email. Pending.

From: Sanders, Chad

Sent: Tuesday, April 12, 2011 11:52 AM

To: 'Robert Hrubes'

Cc: mferrucci@iforest.com; Boyles, Bob; Brendan Grady; Amy Hsu

Subject: RE: Ohio FSC CAR's due 3 months after award

Robert

I inadvertently missed that there was 1 additional Minor CAR with a 3 month deadline. In total, Ohio DOF had 3 Minor CAR's with 3 month deadlines. Two were already discussed earlier, and 1 dealing with chain-of-custody is being addressed now with this email. We did address this Minor CAR early on since it impacted our purchasers of forest products and the attachments are included as evidence. Chad

Nonconformity: The chain-of-custody procedures prepared for the audit were adequate to cover merchandizing log yards, but did not properly address stumpage sales.	
Minor CAR 2010.11	Extend the stump to gate chain-of-custody procedures to cover stumpage sales
Deadline	Three months after the award of certification
Reference	FSC US National Indicator 8.3.a

Response: DOF updated Chapter 12 of the Land Management Manual to include stump-to-gate chain-of-custody procedures for stumpage timber sales. Further, all stumpage sale purchasers with existing contracts were notified with a letter that noted our certification status with instructions to contact Chad Sanders for information on CoC procedures. Finally, our stumpage timber sale agreement (contract) was updated to include CoC procedures to stumpage sales. The attached documents with certification statements were reviewed/approved by SCS (Rachel Lem) prior to use by DOF.

Evidence: Attachments

Chapter 12 revised (page 3)

Letter to purchasers

Timber Sale Bid Prospectus

Timber Sale Agreement example (page 9 and 10)

Chad Sanders - Land Management Administrator	
EVIDENCE OF CONFORMANCE SUBMITTED WITH THIS FORM <i>(please list)</i> Chapter 12 LM Manual, Letter to contract holders Example bid prospectus Example contract.	
FME Representative Name and Title	Date
TO BE COMPLETED BY SCS REPRESENTATIVE SCS REVIEW / ACCEPTANCE OF CORRECTIVE ACTION <i>(Describe conclusion in detail)</i> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> CLOSED <input type="checkbox"/> UPGRADED TO MAJOR <input type="checkbox"/> OTHER DECISION <i>(refer to description above)</i>	
SCS Representative Name and Title (CAR/OBS reviewer) Robert Hrubes	Date of Acceptance of Corrective Action 4/12/2011
<i>Press Enter twice below table to leave a space, then copy and paste table below for each CAR/OBS</i>	

TO BE COMPLETED BY SCS REPRESENTATIVE	CAR/OBS Number (e.g. 1, 2, ...)	2010.1
	Select one:	<input type="checkbox"/> Major CAR <input type="checkbox"/> Minor CAR <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Observation
	Site CAR/OBS issued to (where more than one site)	
	Deadline for Corrective Action by FME	
	<input type="checkbox"/> 3 months from above Date of Issuance <input type="checkbox"/> Next audit (surveillance or re-evaluation) <input type="checkbox"/> Pre-condition to certification <input type="checkbox"/> Other deadline (specify):	
Standard and Requirement Reference	FSC US National Indicator 1.5.b	
NON-CONFORMITY (or Background/ Justification in the case of Observations) (Describe and provide objective evidence)		
REQUESTED CORRECTIVE ACTION (or Observation) ODOF should continue to actively guard against the risks of timber theft. The Strickland/Brush Creek incident that arose during the field evaluation is a case in point that merits additional oversight.		

TO BE COMPLETED BY FME	IMPLEMENTED CORRECTIVE ACTION <i>(Response to Observations is optional)</i> Describe action taken by the FME to address the root cause of the non-conformity This observation references two separate issues. DOF considers the issues separate and un-related but they are wrapped into one in this finding. <u>Strickland</u> : Due to multiple repeated violations in 2010, Larry Strickland (L&L Excavating and Land Clearing) was banned for one year, with the exception of the remaining portions of one small timber sale at Brush Creek where no violations occurred. Greg Guess assigned as TSA on Brush Creek Sale with Strickland. The TSA notes that performance of Mr. Strickland was acceptable and appropriate during the completion of this sale. Just prior to the ending of the one-year ban, Mr. Strickland requested reinstatement by the Division. Chief Boyles, District Manager Jester, Greg Guess and Chad Sanders evaluated conditions by which Strickland should be reinstated. Strickland reinstated July 2011, one-year after his ban was completed. Mr. Strickland has not purchased any timber sales since his reinstatement. As a condition of the reinstatement, Mr. Strickland had to provide formal logger training to additional 3 members of his crew. <u>Timber Theft</u> : The Shawnee timber theft / Alan Bray Logging is not related to Strickland. Case is still pending and under investigation by law enforcement	
	EVIDENCE OF CONFORMANCE SUBMITTED WITH THIS FORM <i>(please list)</i> Strickland letter of request Strickland letter of reinstatement	
	FME Representative Name and Title	Date
TO BE COMPLETED BY SCS REPRESENTATIVE	SCS REVIEW / ACCEPTANCE OF CORRECTIVE ACTION <i>(Describe conclusion in detail)</i> ODNR has actively participated in the timber theft case, although it is now in the hands of law enforcement. The audit team interviewed a state forest patrol officer and was impressed with the level of attention devoted to investigating illegal activities on the forest.	
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> CLOSED <input type="checkbox"/> UPGRADED TO MAJOR <input type="checkbox"/> OTHER DECISION (refer to description above)	
SCS Representative Name and Title (CAR/OBS reviewer)	Date of Acceptance of Corrective Action	
Brendan Grady	9/23/11	
Press Enter twice below table to leave a space, then copy and paste table below for each CAR/OBS		

TO BE COMPLETED BY SCS REPRESENTATIVE	CAR/OBS Number (e.g. 1, 2, ...)		2010.2
	Select one: <input type="checkbox"/> Major CAR <input type="checkbox"/> Minor CAR <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Observation		
	Site CAR/OBS issued to (where more than one site)		
	Deadline for Corrective Action by FME		
	<input type="checkbox"/> 3 months frm above Date of Issuance <input type="checkbox"/> Next audit (surveillance or re-evaluaion) <input type="checkbox"/> Pre-condition to certification <input type="checkbox"/> Other deadline (specify):		
Standard and Requirement Reference		FSC US National Indicator 5.6.a	
NON-CONFORMITY (or Background/ Justification in the case of Observations) <i>(Describe and provide objective evidence)</i>			
REQUESTED CORRECTIVE ACTION (or Observation) The process employed for establishing the annual allowable harvest (AAC) is not adequately documented.			

TO BE COMPLETED BY FME	IMPLEMENTED CORRECTIVE ACTION <i>(Response to Observations is optional)</i> Describe action taken by the FME to address the root cause of the non-conformity Under new direction, DOF has set an annual harvest goal for 2012 of 40% of annual growth. A description of this harvest goal has been included in the 5-year management plans, and annual work plans. In order to better explain the rationale and mathematics involved, DOF produced a document detailing the calculation of AAC and posted it on website, and provided it to interested stakeholders.	
	EVIDENCE OF CONFORMANCE SUBMITTED WITH THIS FORM <i>(please list)</i> 5-year Management Plans 40% document	
	FME Representative Name and Title	Date
TO BE COMPLETED BY SCS REPRESENTATIVE	SCS REVIEW / ACCEPTANCE OF CORRECTIVE ACTION <i>(Describe conclusion in detail)</i> The audit team reviewed the updated 5-year management plans, which included a section III(B) covering Sustained Growth and Yield calculations, as well as the publicly available description of the rationale behind setting ODNR's harvest rates. At 40% of growth, harvesting is currently well below what would normally be considered the maximum sustainable harvest rate.	
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> CLOSED <input type="checkbox"/> UPGRADED TO MAJOR <input type="checkbox"/> OTHER DECISION <i>(refer to description above)</i>	
	SCS Representative Name and Title <i>(CAR/OBS reviewer)</i> Brendan Grady	Date of Acceptance of Corrective Action 9/23/11
Press Enter twice below table to leave a space, then copy and paste table below for each CAR/OBS		

TO BE COMPLETED BY SCS REPRESENTATIVE	CAR/OBS Number (e.g. 1, 2, ...)		2010.3
	Select one: <input type="checkbox"/> Major CAR <input type="checkbox"/> Minor CAR <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Observation		
	Site CAR/OBS issued to (where more than one site)		
	Deadline for Corrective Action by FME		
	<input type="checkbox"/> 3 months from above Date of Issuance <input type="checkbox"/> Next audit (surveillance or re-evaluation) <input type="checkbox"/> Pre-condition to certification <input type="checkbox"/> Other deadline (specify):		
Standard and Requirement Reference		FSC US National Indicator 6.1.a	
NON-CONFORMITY (or Background/ Justification in the case of Observations) <i>(Describe and provide objective evidence)</i>			
REQUESTED CORRECTIVE ACTION (or Observation) <p>The FMU-wide assessment of forest conditions is not documented in a fully coordinated and coherent manner. Demonstrating conformity to the six subject areas of this Indicator would be better served with a more focused treatment.</p>			

TO BE COMPLETED BY FME	IMPLEMENTED CORRECTIVE ACTION <i>(Response to Observations is optional)</i> Describe action taken by the FME to address the root cause of the non-conformity This assessment was completed in two ways: 1) An FMU wide assessment of forest conditions was conducted as part of the RSA assessment. 2)80% of state forest acreage was inventoried in 2009.	
	EVIDENCE OF CONFORMANCE SUBMITTED WITH THIS FORM <i>(please list)</i> The RSA Assessment – posted on our website The 2009 Inventory report – posted on our website	
	FME Representative Name and Title	Date
TO BE COMPLETED BY SCS REPRESENTATIVE	SCS REVIEW / ACCEPTANCE OF CORRECTIVE ACTION <i>(Describe conclusion in detail)</i> The two documents referenced above are adequate to address this observation.	
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> CLOSED <input type="checkbox"/> UPGRADED TO MAJOR <input type="checkbox"/> OTHER DECISION (refer to description above)	
	SCS Representative Name and Title (CAR/OBS reviewer) Brendan Grady	Date of Acceptance of Corrective Action 9/23/11
Press Enter twice below table to leave a space, then copy and paste table below for each CAR/OBS		

TO BE COMPLETED BY SCS REPRESENTATIVE	CAR/OBS Number (e.g. 1, 2, ...)		2010.4
	Select one: <input type="checkbox"/> Major CAR <input type="checkbox"/> inor AR <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Observation		
	Site CAR/OBS issued to (where more than one site)		
	Deadline for Corrective Action by FME		
	<input type="checkbox"/> 3 onths from above Date of Issuance <input type="checkbox"/> Next audit (surveillance or re-evaluation) <input type="checkbox"/> Pre-condition to certification <input type="checkbox"/> Other deadline (specify):		
Standard and Requirement Reference		FSC US National Indicator 6.1.b & 6.3.i	
NON-CONFORMITY (or Background/ Justification in the case of Observations) <i>(Describe and provide objective evidence)</i>			
REQUESTED CORRECTIVE ACTION (or Observation) <p>There is an opportunity to engage in additional scientific consultation regarding the use of prescribed fire as a tool for achieving desired forest cover conditions (re-establishment of oak). Likewise, there is an opportunity to seek additional expert input on the manner and timing of prescribed fire with regard to efficacy.</p>			

TO BE COMPLETED BY FME	IMPLEMENTED CORRECTIVE ACTION <i>(Response to Observations is optional)</i> Describe action taken by the FME to address the root cause of the non-conformity Additional scientific consultation was solicited and received during our efforts to formulate a fire monitoring protocol. In the past year, to strengthen our scientific knowledge and consultation, two division staff attended the Fire in the Eastern Oaks Conference in Missouri. This included the Southern District Manager, and Greg Guess.	
	EVIDENCE OF CONFORMANCE SUBMITTED WITH THIS FORM <i>(please list)</i> Fire Conference	
	FME Representative Name and Title	Date
TO BE COMPLETED BY SCS REPRESENTATIVE	SCS REVIEW / ACCEPTANCE OF CORRECTIVE ACTION <i>(Describe conclusion in detail)</i> The consultation that went into developing a new fire monitoring protocol is material to addressing the concerns in this observation. See also CAR 2010.8.	
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> CLOSED <input type="checkbox"/> UPGRADED TO MAJOR <input type="checkbox"/> OTHER DECISION <i>(refer to description above)</i>	
	SCS Representative Name and Title (CAR/OBS reviewer) Brendan Grady	Date of Acceptance of Corrective Action 9/23/11
Press Enter twice below table to leave a space, then copy and paste table below for each CAR/OBS		

TO BE COMPLETED BY SCS REPRESENTATIVE	CAR/OBS Number (e.g. 1, 2, ...)	2010.5
	Select one:	<input type="checkbox"/> Major CAR <input type="checkbox"/> Minor CAR <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Observation
	Site CAR/OBS issued to (where more than one site)	
	Deadline for Corrective Action by FME	
	<input type="checkbox"/> 3 months from above Date of Issuance <input type="checkbox"/> Next audit (surveillance or re-evaluation) <input type="checkbox"/> Pre-condition to certification <input type="checkbox"/> Other deadline (specify):	
Standard and Requirement Reference	FSC US National Indicator 6.2.a	
NON-CONFORMITY (or Background/ Justification in the case of Observations) (Describe and provide objective evidence)		
REQUESTED CORRECTIVE ACTION (or Observation) Ongoing staff reductions and the elimination of the Division of Natural Areas and Preserves is straining the Department's ability to conform to the RTE assessment and survey requirements.		

TO BE COMPLETED BY FME	IMPLEMENTED CORRECTIVE ACTION <i>(Response to Observations is optional)</i> Describe action taken by the FME to address the root cause of the non-conformity During a recent re-organization, the Heritage Database was renamed to the Ohio Biodiversity Database and is now being managed by the Division of Wildlife. The Division of Wildlife is securely funded and will be able to maintain this needed program. The Division of Forestry has contributed to the Biodiversity Database over the last year, in that when we conduct RTE assessments, the results are given to the Division of Wildlife to update the Biodiversity Database. DOF has a botanist on staff (Brian Riley) who provides the findings of his reviews to DOW for updating of the Biodiversity Database.	
	EVIDENCE OF CONFORMANCE SUBMITTED WITH THIS FORM <i>(please list)</i> RTE assessments – Brian Riley	
	FME Representative Name and Title	Date
TO BE COMPLETED BY SCS REPRESENTATIVE	SCS REVIEW / ACCEPTANCE OF CORRECTIVE ACTION <i>(Describe conclusion in detail)</i> Evidence of RTE assessments by Brian Riley in the past year shows that ODNR is still maintaining its ability to address the requirements of the standard despite tough budget conditions. At the time of the audit, staffing levels and reorganizations continue to be an ongoing concern, but current staffing seemed adequate.	
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> CLOSED <input type="checkbox"/> UPGRADED TO MAJOR <input type="checkbox"/> OTHER DECISION <i>(refer to description above)</i>	
	SCS Representative Name and Title (CAR/OBS reviewer) Brendan Grady	Date of Acceptance of Corrective Action 9/23/11
Press Enter twice below table to leave a space, then copy and paste table below for each CAR/OBS		

TO BE COMPLETED BY SCS REPRESENTATIVE	CAR/OBS Number (e.g. 1, 2, ...)	2010.6
	Select one:	<input type="checkbox"/> Major CAR <input type="checkbox"/> Minor CAR <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Observation
	Site CAR/OBS issued to (where more than one site)	
	Deadline for Corrective Action by FME	
	<input type="checkbox"/> 3 months from above Date of Issuance <input type="checkbox"/> Next audit (surveillance or re-evaluation) <input type="checkbox"/> Pre-condition to certification <input type="checkbox"/> Other deadline (specify):	
Standard and Requirement Reference	FSC US National Indicators 6.3.e & 6.9.a	
NON-CONFORMITY (or Background/ Justification in the case of Observations) (Describe and provide objective evidence)		
REQUESTED CORRECTIVE ACTION (or Observation) Use of a local, native erosion control seed mix would assure better conformity to the requirements that use of non-native species occurs only where justified and risk assessments have been completed.		

TO BE COMPLETED BY FME	IMPLEMENTED CORRECTIVE ACTION <i>(Response to Observations is optional)</i> Describe action taken by the FME to address the root cause of the non-conformity DOF can show progress on this observation in that over the last year, DOF has applied for and secured grant funding in partnership with NWTF to use local seed mixes for logging site rehab. DOF also notes the limited availability of “native” seed mixes in our area, and further notes research supporting better seed mixes for logging rehab from the Fernow Experimental Forest.	
	EVIDENCE OF CONFORMANCE SUBMITTED WITH THIS FORM <i>(please list)</i> Fernow study NWTF grant documents	
	FME Representative Name and Title	Date
TO BE COMPLETED BY SCS REPRESENTATIVE	SCS REVIEW / ACCEPTANCE OF CORRECTIVE ACTION <i>(Describe conclusion in detail)</i> The additional funding and research taken by ODNR adequately addresses this observation.	
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> CLOSED <input type="checkbox"/> UPGRADED TO MAJOR <input type="checkbox"/> OTHER DECISION <i>(refer to description above)</i>	
	SCS Representative Name and Title (CAR/OBS reviewer) Brendan Grady	Date of Acceptance of Corrective Action 9/23/11
Press Enter twice below table to leave a space, then copy and paste table below for each CAR/OBS		

TO BE COMPLETED BY SCS REPRESENTATIVE	CAR/OBS Number (e.g. 1, 2, ...)		2010.7
	Select one: <input type="checkbox"/> Major CAR <input type="checkbox"/> Minor CAR <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Observation		
	Site CAR/OBS issued to (where more than one site)		
	Deadline for Corrective Action by FME		
	<input type="checkbox"/> 3 months from above Date of Issuance <input type="checkbox"/> Next audit (surveillance or re-evaluation) <input type="checkbox"/> Pre-condition to certification <input type="checkbox"/> Other deadline (specify):		
Standard and Requirement Reference		FSC US National Indicator 6.3.g.1	
NON-CONFORMITY (or Background/ Justification in the case of Observations) (Describe and provide objective evidence)			
REQUESTED CORRECTIVE ACTION (or Observation) Through additional training, ODOF should clarify its policy, found in the Land Management Manual, that retention of residual live trees within an even-aged regeneration harvest must be 20 square feet of basal area <i>per acre</i> in order to comply with Appendix C of the National Standard.			

TO BE COMPLETED BY FME	IMPLEMENTED CORRECTIVE ACTION <i>(Response to Observations is optional)</i> Describe action taken by the FME to address the root cause of the non-conformity Revised in the Land Management Manual	
	EVIDENCE OF CONFORMANCE SUBMITTED WITH THIS FORM <i>(please list)</i> Chapter 4 of Land Management Manual	
	FME Representative Name and Title	Date
TO BE COMPLETED BY SCS REPRESENTATIVE	SCS REVIEW / ACCEPTANCE OF CORRECTIVE ACTION <i>(Describe conclusion in detail)</i> The revision to the land management manual addresses this observation.	
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> CLOSED <input type="checkbox"/> UPGRADED TO MAJOR <input type="checkbox"/> OTHER DECISION <i>(refer to description above)</i>	
	SCS Representative Name and Title (CAR/OBS reviewer) Brendan Grady	Date of Acceptance of Corrective Action 9/23/11
Press Enter twice below table to leave a space, then copy and paste table below for each CAR/OBS		

TO BE COMPLETED BY SCS REPRESENTATIVE	CAR/OBS Number (e.g. 1, 2, ...)		2010.8
	Select one: <input type="checkbox"/> Major CAR <input type="checkbox"/> Minor CAR <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Observation		
	Site CAR/OBS issued to (where more than one site)		
	Deadline for Corrective Action by FME		
	<input type="checkbox"/> 3 months from above Date of Issuance <input type="checkbox"/> Next audit (surveillance or re-evaluation) <input type="checkbox"/> Pre-condition to certification <input type="checkbox"/> Other deadline (specify):		
Standard and Requirement Reference		FSC US National Indicator 6.3.h	
NON-CONFORMITY (or Background/ Justification in the case of Observations) (Describe and provide objective evidence)			
REQUESTED CORRECTIVE ACTION (or Observation)			
The stimulus-funded Ohio Woodland Job Corps (OWJC) has proven to be of great value to the Department over the past two years. Unfortunately, funding for this program ends as of 12/31/10 which will have an adverse impact on the Department's ability to manage invasive species control in a manner that will demonstrate ongoing compliance with the certification standard.			

TO BE COMPLETED BY FME	IMPLEMENTED CORRECTIVE ACTION <i>(Response to Observations is optional)</i> Describe action taken by the FME to address the root cause of the non-conformity The Division has continued invasive species control programs in overlapping but distinct efforts over the past year: 1) The OWJC has continued in a smaller scale but valuable fashion in order to use carryover grant funding. This funding is expected to last through December. Temporary staff have been retained to conduct invasive plant work across the state forest system. Search continues for additional funding to prolong the program. 2) The GLRI grant has an invasive species control aspect for Maumee State Forest. 3) Two staff foresters focused primarily on invasive plant and forest health issues have made great strides in educational and outreach efforts, installing demonstration areas, working with partners, and conducting control projects. The OWJC trainings have had the unintentional benefit of providing awareness and training to existing full-time staff that will benefit the Division in the future.	
	EVIDENCE OF CONFORMANCE SUBMITTED WITH THIS FORM <i>(please list)</i> OWJC continues Stephanie Downs Annemarie Smith	
	FME Representative Name and Title	Date
TO BE COMPLETED BY SCS REPRESENTATIVE	SCS REVIEW / ACCEPTANCE OF CORRECTIVE ACTION <i>(Describe conclusion in detail)</i> The actions described above should allow ODNR to mitigate the loss of the OWJC funding, at least in the short term.	
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> CLOSED <input type="checkbox"/> UPGRADED TO MAJOR <input type="checkbox"/> OTHER DECISION <i>(refer to description above)</i>	
	SCS Representative Name and Title <i>(CAR/OBS reviewer)</i> Brendan Grady	Date of Acceptance of Corrective Action 9/23/11
<i>Press Enter twice below table to leave a space, then copy and paste table below for each CAR/OBS</i>		

TO BE COMPLETED BY SCS REPRESENTATIVE	CAR/OBS Number (e.g. 1, 2, ...)		2010.9
	Select one: <input type="checkbox"/> Major CAR <input type="checkbox"/> Minor CAR <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Observation		
	Site CAR/OBS issued to (where more than one site)		
	Deadline for Corrective Action by FME		
	<input type="checkbox"/> 3 months from above Date of Issuance <input type="checkbox"/> Next audit (surveillance or re-evaluation) <input type="checkbox"/> Pre-condition to certification <input type="checkbox"/> Other deadline (specify):		
	Standard and Requirement Reference		FSC US National Indicator 6.5.e
NON-CONFORMITY (or Background/ Justification in the case of Observations) (Describe and provide objective evidence)			
REQUESTED CORRECTIVE ACTION (or Observation) Not all field foresters demonstrate an adequate working knowledge of Section D of Chapter 4 of the Manual, pertaining to stream buffer guidelines.			

TO BE COMPLETED BY FME	IMPLEMENTED CORRECTIVE ACTION <i>(Response to Observations is optional)</i> Describe action taken by the FME to address the root cause of the non-conformity DOF conducted additional trainings for field foresters at the district level to discuss these items.	
	EVIDENCE OF CONFORMANCE SUBMITTED WITH THIS FORM <i>(please list)</i> Trainings	
	FME Representative Name and Title	Date
TO BE COMPLETED BY SCS REPRESENTATIVE	SCS REVIEW / ACCEPTANCE OF CORRECTIVE ACTION <i>(Describe conclusion in detail)</i> The audit team interviewed staff foresters in the field and found that they could cite the requirements for stream side buffers and other watercourse protection measures.	
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> CLOSED <input type="checkbox"/> UPGRADED TO MAJOR <input type="checkbox"/> OTHER DECISION <i>(refer to description above)</i>	
	SCS Representative Name and Title <i>(CAR/OBS reviewer)</i> Brendan Grady	Date of Acceptance of Corrective Action 9/23/11
Press Enter twice below table to leave a space, then copy and paste table below for each CAR/OBS		

TO BE COMPLETED BY SCS REPRESENTATIVE	CAR/OBS Number (e.g. 1, 2, ...)		2010.10
	Select one: <input type="checkbox"/> Major CAR <input type="checkbox"/> Minor CAR <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Observation		
	Site CAR/OBS issued to (where more than one site)		
	Deadline for Corrective Action by FME <input type="checkbox"/> 3 months from above Date of Issuance <input type="checkbox"/> Next audit (surveillance or re-evaluation) <input type="checkbox"/> Pre-condition to certification <input type="checkbox"/> Other deadline (specify):		
	Standard and Requirement Reference		FSC US National Indicator 7.1.b&c
NON-CONFORMITY (or Background/ Justification in the case of Observations) (Describe and provide objective evidence)			
REQUESTED CORRECTIVE ACTION (or Observation) Conformity to the requirement that there be a description of the history of land use, past management, current conditions, desired future conditions and applicable management objectives (and other topics mentioned in Indicators 7.1.b&c) would be enhanced by more property-specific content within the management plans.			

TO BE COMPLETED BY FME	IMPLEMENTED CORRECTIVE ACTION <i>(Response to Observations is optional)</i> Describe action taken by the FME to address the root cause of the non-conformity Property specific content is present in all the management plans as well as the annual work plans. Significant enhancements were made to a few plans.	
	EVIDENCE OF CONFORMANCE SUBMITTED WITH THIS FORM <i>(please list)</i> Management plans	
	FME Representative Name and Title	Date
TO BE COMPLETED BY SCS REPRESENTATIVE	SCS REVIEW / ACCEPTANCE OF CORRECTIVE ACTION <i>(Describe conclusion in detail)</i> While the plans still contain large amounts of text that are applicable to Ohio forests at a landscape level, there has been enhancement to some of the plans to add more local context to them, in particular the Shawnee State Forest management plan, which describes specific land use history such as the activities of the Civilian Conservation Corps in the 30s and the more recent ice storm of 2003.	
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> CLOSED <input type="checkbox"/> UPGRADED TO MAJOR <input type="checkbox"/> OTHER DECISION <i>(refer to description above)</i>	
	SCS Representative Name and Title <i>(CAR/OBS reviewer)</i> Brendan Grady	Date of Acceptance of Corrective Action 9/23/11
Press Enter twice below table to leave a space, then copy and paste table below for each CAR/OBS		

TO BE COMPLETED BY SCS REPRESENTATIVE	CAR/OBS Number (e.g. 1, 2, ...)		2010.11
	Select one: <input type="checkbox"/> Major CAR <input type="checkbox"/> Minor CAR <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Observation		
	Site CAR/OBS issued to (where more than one site)		
	Deadline for Corrective Action by FME		
	<input type="checkbox"/> 3 months from above Date of Issuance <input type="checkbox"/> Next audit (surveillance or re-evaluation) <input type="checkbox"/> Pre-condition to certification <input type="checkbox"/> Other deadline (specify):		
Standard and Requirement Reference		FSC US National Indicator 7.2.a	
NON-CONFORMITY (or Background/ Justification in the case of Observations) (Describe and provide objective evidence)			
REQUESTED CORRECTIVE ACTION (or Observation)			
ODOF should incorporate into its planning documentation an explicit and affirmative statement that management plan revisions will take place on a frequency no longer than every 10 years, rather than the present statement that it is the Department’s “intent” to do so.			

TO BE COMPLETED BY FME	IMPLEMENTED CORRECTIVE ACTION <i>(Response to Observations is optional)</i> Describe action taken by the FME to address the root cause of the non-conformity Each 5-year management plan was revised to include an explicit statement that all plans will be updated in the fiscal year 2016.	
	EVIDENCE OF CONFORMANCE SUBMITTED WITH THIS FORM <i>(please list)</i> 5-year management plans.	
	FME Representative Name and Title	Date
TO BE COMPLETED BY SCS REPRESENTATIVE	SCS REVIEW / ACCEPTANCE OF CORRECTIVE ACTION <i>(Describe conclusion in detail)</i> The auditor confirmed that there are explicit time period targets stating the goal of revising the plans every 5 years in the table of contents section of the plans.	
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> CLOSED <input type="checkbox"/> UPGRADED TO MAJOR <input type="checkbox"/> OTHER DECISION <i>(refer to description above)</i>	
	SCS Representative Name and Title <i>(CAR/OBS reviewer)</i> Brendan Grady	Date of Acceptance of Corrective Action 9/23/11
Press Enter twice below table to leave a space, then copy and paste table below for each CAR/OBS		

TO BE COMPLETED BY SCS REPRESENTATIVE	CAR/OBS Number (e.g. 1, 2, ...)	2010.12
	Select one:	<input type="checkbox"/> Major CAR <input type="checkbox"/> Minor CAR <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Observation
	Site CAR/OBS issued to (where more than one site)	
	Deadline for Corrective Action by FME	
	<input type="checkbox"/> 3 months from above Date of Issuance <input type="checkbox"/> Next audit (surveillance or re-evaluation) <input type="checkbox"/> Pre-condition to certification <input type="checkbox"/> Other deadline (specify):	
Standard and Requirement Reference	FSC US National Indicator 7.3.a	
NON-CONFORMITY (or Background/ Justification in the case of Observations) (Describe and provide objective evidence)		
REQUESTED CORRECTIVE ACTION (or Observation) Employees of contractors are a weaker aspect of ODOF's training policies and procedures, constituting an opportunity for improvement.		

TO BE COMPLETED BY FME	IMPLEMENTED CORRECTIVE ACTION <i>(Response to Observations is optional)</i> Describe action taken by the FME to address the root cause of the non-conformity DOF encourages employees of contractors to complete the Master Logger Training program. As a condition of the re-instatement, DOF required Strickland to have 3 additional employees complete the Master Logger training. DOF can also cite one example of getting a new logging contractor certified through the Master Logger program in order to work on state forests	
	EVIDENCE OF CONFORMANCE SUBMITTED WITH THIS FORM <i>(please list)</i> Larry Strickland reinstatement letter DOF involvement in OFA, LeMay Logging example (Twin Oak Sale)	
	FME Representative Name and Title	Date
TO BE COMPLETED BY SCS REPRESENTATIVE	SCS REVIEW / ACCEPTANCE OF CORRECTIVE ACTION <i>(Describe conclusion in detail)</i> The increased presence of Master logger trained loggers on the forest through the referenced materials is adequate to address this observation.	
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> CLOSED <input type="checkbox"/> UPGRADED TO MAJOR <input type="checkbox"/> OTHER DECISION (refer to description above)	
	SCS Representative Name and Title (CAR/OBS reviewer) Brendan Grady	Date of Acceptance of Corrective Action 9/23/11
Press Enter twice below table to leave a space, then copy and paste table below for each CAR/OBS		

5.2 New CARs and Observations

TO BE COMPLETED BY SCS REPRESENTATIVE	CAR/OBS Number (e.g. 1, 2, ...)		2011.1
	Select one: <input type="checkbox"/> Major CAR <input type="checkbox"/> Minor CAR <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Observation		
	Site CAR/OBS issued to (where more than one site)		
	Deadline for Corrective Action by FME		
	<input type="checkbox"/> 3 months from above Date of Issuance <input type="checkbox"/> Next audit (surveillance or re-evaluation) <input type="checkbox"/> Pre-condition to certification <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other deadline (specify): non-binding observation		
	Standard and Requirement Reference		FSC US National Indicator 7.3.a
NON-CONFORMITY (or Background/ Justification in the case of Observations) (Describe and provide objective evidence) Interviews with new forester Dale Egbert did not show systematic implementation of an approach for training new staff. Dale himself is an experienced forester (only new to DOF) so training is less crucial. However it did reveal an opportunity to improve DOF's training efforts.			
REQUESTED CORRECTIVE ACTION (or Observation) Procedures for ensuring that new employees receive adequate training could be improved to ensure proper implementation of the management plan.			

TO BE COMPLETED BY FME	IMPLEMENTED CORRECTIVE ACTION <i>(Response to Observations is optional)</i> Describe action taken by the FME to address the root cause of the non-conformity	
	EVIDENCE OF CONFORMANCE SUBMITTED WITH THIS FORM <i>(please list)</i>	
	FME Representative Name and Title	Date
TO BE COMPLETED BY SCS REPRESENTATIVE	SCS REVIEW / ACCEPTANCE OF CORRECTIVE ACTION <i>(Describe conclusion in detail)</i>	
	<input type="checkbox"/> CLOSED <input type="checkbox"/> UPGRADED TO MAJOR <input type="checkbox"/> OTHER DECISION <i>(refer to description above)</i>	
	SCS Representative Name and Title (CAR/OBS reviewer)	Date of Acceptance of Corrective Action
Press Enter twice below table to leave a space, then copy and paste table below for each CAR/OBS		

6.0 Stakeholder Comment*

SCS conducts stakeholder outreach as part of annual audits in order to assess on-going conformance to the applicable FSC standards. Stakeholder consultation activities can include telephone calls, written letters, emails or consultation in the field. The results of stakeholder consultation activities are

summarized below. Where a stakeholder comment has triggered a subsequent investigation during the evaluation, the corresponding follow-up action and conclusions from SCS have been noted.

Box 6.1 – Summary of Stakeholder Comments and Responses from the Team Where Applicable	
Stakeholder comments	SCS Response
Environmental concerns	
Concerns have been raised about the potential that some area of Ohio state forests would be converted to oil and gas development.	ODNR is aware of the rules regarding conversion in Criterion 6.10, in particular 6.10.f as it pertains specifically to conversion associated with subsurface mineral and gas rights. Conversion in this manner is not completed banned, but does have significant restrictions. Definitive plans for any conversion are still being developed and SCS will monitor the issue during future audits to assess conformance to the standard. No non-conformance is currently warranted.

7.0 Certification Decision

Box 7.1 Surveillance Decision	
The certificate holder has demonstrated continued overall conformance to the applicable Forest Stewardship standards. The SCS annual audit team recommends that the certificate be sustained, subject to subsequent annual audits and the FME's response to any open CARs.	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/>
Comments: No particularly difficult issues presented themselves during the surveillance audit.	

Section B - Appendices

Appendix 1 – List of FMUs selected for evaluation (CONFIDENTIAL)

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> FME consists of a single FMU – <i>No further action required</i>
<input type="checkbox"/> FME consists of multiple FMUs – <i>See table below, which applies to multiple FMU and group management evaluations, but is inapplicable if the scope of the evaluation is a single FMU.</i>

Appendix 2 – Evaluation of Management Systems (CONFIDENTIAL)*

This annual audit involved review of documentation associated with closing out the open non-conformances from last year's full evaluation, as well as interviews with staff about how they were addressing these non-conformances. Field sites were selected based on recent management activities, new or changing management practices.

Appendix 3 – Stakeholder analysis (CONFIDENTIAL)*

3.1 Stakeholder list (confidential)

List of FME Staff Consulted

Name	Title	Consultation method
Chad Sanders	Land Management – North	Interview/Field Consultation
Gregg Maxfield	Northern District Forest Manager	Interview/Field Consultation
Mike Bowden	Fire Program Coordinator	Interview/Field Consultation
Greg Guess	Southern District Land Management Coordinator	Interview/Field Consultation
Nate Jester	District Forester – South	Interview/Field Consultation
Dan Balsler	Assistant Chief	Interview/Field Consultation
Ron Collins	Forest Tech	Interview/Field Consultation
Christopher Kerr	Forest Tech	Interview/Field Consultation
Danzil Walker	Forester – Zaleski	Interview/Field Consultation
Tom Shuman	Forest Manager – Zaleski	Interview/Field Consultation
Aaron Klos	Fire Program/GIS	Interview/Field Consultation

List of other Stakeholders Consulted

Name/ Title	Organization	Consultation method
Dan Yaussy	USFS Research, Delaware OH	Interview/Field Consultation
Richard Hardin	Richard Hardin Logging	Interview/Field Consultation
Nathan Johnson	Staff Attorney, Buckeye Forest Council	Email, letter

3.2 Stakeholder review, complaints, and resolution**Box 3.2.1 – Summary of Stakeholder Comments and Responses from the Team Where Applicable**

FME has not received any stakeholder complaints and the annual audit uncovered no known disputes since the previous evaluation. SCS has not received any complaints from stakeholders regarding its performance or treatment of FME's management system.

**Appendix 4 – Additional Audit Techniques Employed (CONFIDENTIAL)***

The audit team did not employ any additional audit techniques for this annual surveillance audit.

Appendix 5 – Changes in Certification Scope

There were no changes in the scope of the certification during the previous year.

Appendix 6 – Pesticide derogations

ODNR does not hold any pesticide derogations.

Appendix 7 – Detailed observations (CONFIDENTIAL)

Evaluation year	FSC P&C Reviewed
2010	All – Certification Evaluation
2011	1.5, 2.3, 3.2, 4.2, 4.4, 4.5, 5.6, 6.1, 6.2, 6.3, 6.5, 6.9, 7.1, 7.2, 7.3, 7.4, 8.1, 8.2, 8.3, 9.1, and 9.4
2012	
2013	
2014	

Since this was the first surveillance evaluation after the initial full evaluation, the criteria selected for evaluation focused on outstanding Corrective Action Requests, rather than focusing on a specific principle. In addition, other mandatory criteria were reviewed based on ODNR's size and the presence of HCVF.

C= Conformance with Criterion

C/NC= Overall Conformance with Criterion, but there are Indicator non-conformances

NC= Non-Conformance with Criterion

REQUIREMENT	C/NC	COMMENT/CAR
P1 Forest management shall respect all applicable laws of the country in which they occur, and international treaties and agreements to which the country is a signatory, and comply with all FSC Principles and Criteria.		
<p>C1.5. Forest management areas should be protected from illegal harvesting, settlement and other unauthorized activities.</p>	<p>C</p>	<p>The audit team has found adequate overall conformity with this Criterion.</p> <p>DOF has a fully funded Law Enforcement and Recreation program. Commissioned officers regularly patrol state forests. Although they are ODNR employees, they commissioned to enforce any laws with the same jurisdiction as local law enforcement. In addition, DOF pools resources with local law enforcement agencies.</p> <p>Signs and gates were regularly observed to be utilized on the state forests during the field audit.</p> <p>The biggest potential issues on ODNR forests are vandalism, litter, drugs, arson, and illegal off-road vehicle use. The audit team interviewed officer J.D. Deemer, who described enforcement mechanisms. Daily patrol logs are submitted to the forest managers describing any unauthorized activities. When illegal dumping is found, attempts are made to investigate the source, which has resulted in successful prosecutions.</p> <p>ODNR also controls illegal off-roading to areas by closing off roads with impassable water bars.</p> <p>OBS 2010.1 was closed. ODNR has actively participated in the timber theft case, although it is now in the hands of law enforcement. The audit team interviewed a state forest patrol officer and was impressed with the level of attention devoted to investigating illegal activities on the forest.</p>

P2 Long-term tenure and use rights to the land and forest resources shall be clearly defined, documented and legally established.		
C2.3. Appropriate mechanisms shall be employed to resolve disputes over tenure claims and use rights. The circumstances and status of any outstanding disputes will be explicitly considered in the certification evaluation. Disputes of substantial magnitude involving a significant number of interests will normally disqualify an operation from being certified.	C	There are no customary use rights on ODNR forests, as these are defined in the standard as rights having the force of law. There were no disputes over ODNR's tenure. There were no significant disputes over tenure. However, any that did occur would be documented extensively as part of the court process.
P3 The legal and customary rights of indigenous peoples to own, use and manage their lands, territories, and resources shall be recognized and respected.		
C3.2. Forest management shall not threaten or diminish, either directly or indirectly, the resources or tenure rights of indigenous peoples.	C	As part of the certification process, ODNR has engaged in active outreach to tribes seeking input on management, although there has not been significant response. DOF attempted multiple efforts to organize a diverse group of experts on American Indian affairs to advise the Division on potential "BMPs" for working with tribes and around tribal resources. This effort was unsuccessful in 2011 due to many factors not the least of which was state budgetary reorganizations. The intent of DOF is to continue this effort with interested and new parties.
P4 Forest management operations shall maintain or enhance the long-term social and economic well-being of forest workers and local communities.		
C4.2. Forest management should meet or exceed all applicable laws and/or regulations covering health and safety of employees and their families.	C	The audit team has found adequate overall conformity with this Criterion. Hard hats and other safety equipment were in use during the audit. Inspections of active logging sites showed that first aid kits were present. DOF held annual safety day at Hocking State Forest in June 2011. Department has started a safety committee involving DOF. Several safety trainings were held in 2011. The standard logging contract includes safety provisions. Master Logger status is required for at least one individual in every logging contractor Safe practices were observed in the field
C4.4. Management planning and operations shall incorporate the results of evaluations of social impact. Consultations shall be maintained with people and groups (both men and women) directly affected by	C	The audit team has found marginally adequate overall conformity with this Criterion. Beginning in January 2011, the Division of Forestry has

<p>management operations.</p>		<p>enhanced public input and consultation activities. Two new DOF initiatives were rolled out for stakeholder input 1) APV area expansions at Fernwood and Maumee and 2) incremental increase of annual harvest levels to 40% of annual growth. The format of stakeholder meetings was adjusted to include a presentation of new management changes and upcoming planned harvest. Previously open houses had only been Q&A sessions.</p> <p>Also, Chief Boyles has been engaging in direct meetings with individual stakeholder groups in order to facilitate communication, including: : The Ohio Horsemen’s Council, The Toledo Trail Riders, the Buckeye Forest Council, Ohio Environmental Council, Ohio Forestry Association, Sierra Club, ATV groups in Jefferson County, The Nature Conservancy, NWTf, USFS, OSU Extension</p> <p>Minor CAR 2010.1 related to this issue was closed.</p> <p>Direct neighbors are notified prior to site disturbing activities and post cards are mailed prior to fire treatments.</p> <p>The steps taken in response to CAR 2010.1 include enhanced open house activities, direct stakeholder meetings with the chief, and more proactive engagement with the Forest Advisory Council.</p> <p>All these efforts are designed to solicit stakeholder comment and provide opportunities for comment prior to issues arising.</p> <p>An appeal process has been developed which allows an initial path for dispute resolution prior to engaging the court system. http://ohiodnr.com/Default.aspx?tabid=22749</p>
<p>C4.5. Appropriate mechanisms shall be employed for resolving grievances and for providing fair compensation in the case of loss or damage affecting the legal or customary rights, property, resources, or livelihoods of local peoples. Measures shall be taken to avoid such loss or damage.</p>	<p>C</p>	<p>No examples of negligent activities were witnessed during the field audit. There is an active program of removing hazard trees in campgrounds and other recreational facilities.</p> <p>Minor CAR 2010.2 was closed, requiring ODNr’s existing dispute resolution procedures to be more visible. The response was to give them a place of more prominence on the homepage, which addresses the</p>

		<p>issue. The procedures themselves require a response and initial meeting within 10 days with the relevant forest manager. Complainants may appeal to the chief if the result of the initial resolution is unsatisfactory.</p> <p>If the informal dispute resolution fails, the court system is available. No civil claims were brought against DOF in the last year.</p>
<p>P5 Forest management operations shall encourage the efficient use of the forest’s multiple products and services to ensure economic viability and a wide range of environmental and social benefits.</p>		
<p>C5.6. The rate of harvest of forest products shall not exceed levels which can be permanently sustained.</p>	<p>C</p>	<p>The audit team has found adequate overall conformity with this Criterion.</p> <p>A significant change in DOF’s management practice is the goal of raising harvest levels from a historic average of 17% of growth to 40% of growth.</p> <p>OBS 2010.2 was closed identifying improvement in being able to document how the AAC is calculated.</p> <p>Under new direction, DOF has set an annual harvest goal for 2012 of 40% of annual growth. A description of this harvest goal has been included in the 5-year management plans, and annual work plans. In order to better explain the rationale and mathematics involved, DOF produced a document detailing the calculation of AAC and posted it on website, and provided it to interested stakeholders.</p> <p>The audit team reviewed the updated 5-year management plans, which included a section III(B) covering Sustained Growth and Yield calculations, as well as the publicly available description of the rationale behind setting ODNR’s harvest rates. At 40% of growth, harvesting is currently well below what would normally be considered the maximum sustainable harvest rate.</p> <p>Annual harvests have historically averaged 17% of growth. Annual work plans for each forest had been created with the goal of hitting the new 40% of growth mark. Staff foresters admitted that reaching this harvest goal was ambitious given the resources available, and thus the 40% goal may not be realized. Given these harvest projections, the annual harvest levels are not approaching what a calculated sustained yield harvest would be.</p>

		<p>DOFs harvest efforts are in line with their Desired Future Condition, namely increasing the presence of oak in throughout the forest. This strategy is to combat the increase in shade tolerant maples that has occurred over the past century displacing higher valued species. The increase in harvest level, naturally favoring more shade intolerant oaks, furthers this goal.</p>
<p>P6 Forest management shall conserve biological diversity and its associated values, water resources, soils, and unique and fragile ecosystems and landscapes, and, by so doing, maintain the ecological functions and the integrity of the forest.</p>		
<p>C6.1. Assessments of environmental impacts shall be completed -- appropriate to the scale, intensity of forest management and the uniqueness of the affected resources -- and adequately integrated into management systems. Assessments shall include landscape level considerations as well as the impacts of on-site processing facilities. Environmental impacts shall be assessed prior to commencement of site-disturbing operations.</p>	<p>C</p>	<p>The audit team has found adequate overall conformity with this Criterion.</p> <p>As required by criterion, DOF can broadly be said to have a two pronged approach to environmental impact assessment, a landscape level and an individual harvest unit level.</p> <p>OBS 2010.3 was closed: The FMU-wide assessment of forest conditions is not documented in a fully coordinated and coherent manner. Demonstrating conformity to the six subject areas of this Indicator would be better served with a more focused treatment. DOF responded that at a landscape level, an environmental impact assessment was conducted in conjunction with a representative sample analysis prior to the 2010 main evaluation. Existing inventory data from the state forest system was also used.</p> <p>At the individual harvest level, harvesting activities are summarized in annual state forest work plans that are reviewed by DOW biologists. DOF notes that "DOW herpetologists offered insight that resulted in changes to certain units for rattlesnakes. DOW botanist offered comments during HCVF monitoring that resulted in changes to one harvest unit."</p> <p>The audit team reviewed harvest plan documents for each of the sites visited to confirm their adequacy.</p>
<p>C 6.2. Safeguards shall exist which protect rare, threatened and endangered species and their habitats (e.g., nesting and feeding areas). Conservation zones and protection areas shall be established, appropriate to the scale and intensity of forest management and the uniqueness of the affected resources. Inappropriate hunting, fishing, trapping, and collecting shall be controlled.</p>	<p>C</p>	<p>The audit team has found adequate overall conformity with this Criterion.</p> <p>RTE species are regularly taken into account during the development of management plans.</p> <p>The audit team takes positive note of the following</p>

		<p>statements from DOF: "DOW provided comprehensive comments this year on each state forests annual work plan. DOW botanist during HCVF monitoring noted the presence of potential RTE species, and DOF subsequently revised the boundary of the unit to protect those resources.</p> <p>DOW herpetologists' reviews of Shawnee units resulted in a few field visits and slight modifications to plans. DOF botanist is reviewing any positive hits from the database and forwarding findings to the database program administrator. DOW is the new keeper of the database renamed the Ohio Biodiversity Database."</p> <p>Minor CAR 2010.3 was closed, identifying that there was insufficient evidence that management plans and operations took landscape biodiversity goals into account. The CAR was closed based on the following evidence. Through the FRAS (2010 Forest Resource Assessment and Strategies) process, ODNR identified 3 primary landscape level biodiversity conservation goals: Promote regeneration of Oak-hickory forest, Protect unique or rare forest plant species and biological communities, maintain habitat for a diversity of forest-associated wildlife. In general, the biodiversity goals are aimed at increasing areas of early successional and late successional forest habitat, as most of the forest landscape of Ohio is at a similar mid-successional state. These goals were vetted with the public and stakeholders during the FRAS process. These goals were updated in the DOF Desired Future Conditions document, and inserted into the five-year management plans for each forest.</p> <p>OBS 2010.5 was closed, concerning how the capability to conduct surveys would be affected by staff reductions. Evidence of RTE assessments by Brian Riley (DOF staff botanist) in the past year shows that ODNR is still maintaining its ability to address the requirements of the standard despite tough budget conditions.</p>
<p>C6.3. Ecological functions and values shall be maintained intact, enhanced, or restored, including: a) Forest regeneration and succession. b) Genetic, species, and ecosystem diversity. c) Natural cycles that affect the productivity of the forest ecosystem.</p>	<p>C</p>	<p>The audit team has found adequate overall conformity with this Criterion.</p> <p>OBS 2010.6 was closed suggesting the use of local native seed mix for erosion control. DOF responded that local source seed mixes are used. DOF applied for</p>

		<p>and secured grant funding in partnership with NWTF to use local seed mixes for logging site rehab. Currently there is limited availability of native seed mixes in the area, but DOF is supporting research for better seed mixes for logging rehab on the Fernow Experimental Forest.</p> <p>ODF's Desired Future Condition Document was updated to identify specific under-represented successional stages that landscape level management plans are aimed at increasing (such as Oak-hickory forest).</p> <p>CAR 2010.4 was closed, requiring DOF to develop improved modes of coordination with the Division of Wildlife regarding the "Guidelines for Management of Forestland Habitats" and clarify the manner in which these Guidelines will be employed in the field. DOF and DOW revised two sections of the Land Management Manual were: Chapter 4 – Timber Harvest Prep. This chapter was revised to include an update retention policy that reconciles three department-level guidelines on retention trees; and Chapter 5 – Wildlife Management. This chapter was revised to reflect current policies and to establish better direction on wildlife habitat management.</p> <p>Training of DOF foresters occurred on the new updates to the land management manual. Additional training occurred on proper implementation of SMZs.</p> <p>OBS 2010.8 was closed over concerns that the invasive species management would decline after funding ended for the Ohio Woodland Job Corps. Invasive species management has continued, through an extension of the OWJC and additional grants for invasive species control. In addition, DOF has two staff foresters focusing on forest health issues across Ohio. Outreach from these staff foresters is addressing invasive species in an indirect method through education and public awareness.</p>
<p>C6.5. Written guidelines shall be prepared and implemented to control erosion; minimize forest damage during harvesting, road construction, and all other mechanical disturbances; and to protect water resources.</p>	<p>C</p>	<p>The audit team has found adequate overall conformity with this Criterion.</p> <p>Two major developments occurred in response to findings related to this criterion – the development of</p>

		<p>a limited use road inspection procedure and further staff training on implementing proper streamside management zones.</p> <p>Minor CAR 2010.5 was closed related to a road failure on Blackburn Ridge. The audit team reviewed in person the repair efforts at Blackburn ridge road. The road repairs were adequate to address the immediate erosion problem, although the general layout of the road means that further monitoring of it will be required. To address these ongoing issues, ODNR developed a new plan for inventorying their road system (the limited-use road procedure and inspection form), which will provide better information on road engineering issues at a systems level, prioritize areas for repair, and put mitigation plans in place.</p> <p>OBS 2010.9 was closed: Not all field foresters demonstrate an adequate working knowledge of Section D of Chapter 4 of the Manual, pertaining to stream buffer guidelines. Additional training was conducted with field foresters on this topic. Field interviews with foresters indicated that they could cite the requirements for stream side buffers and other watercourse protection measures.</p> <p>Recreation continues to require active monitoring from forest managers in order to control damage to the state forest road system. Driven by stakeholder and DNR request for additional areas for off road vehicle recreation, DOF opened additional trails. However, these were concentrated in the Fernwood state forest. This was chosen because it already allowed ORV use, and was found to have a low possibility of environmental impact due to the area's history as an old mine spoil.</p>
<p>C6.9. The use of exotic species shall be carefully controlled and actively monitored to avoid adverse ecological impacts.</p>	<p>C</p>	<p>The audit team has found adequate overall conformity with this Criterion.</p> <p>DOF does not actively plant exotic species, although some legacy plantations exist.</p> <p>OBS 2010.6 was closed suggesting the use of local native seed mix for erosion control. DOF responded that local source seed mixes are used. DOF applied for and secured grant funding in partnership with NWTF to use local seed mixes for logging site rehab. Currently there is limited availability of native seed mixes in the</p>

		<p>area, but DOF is supporting research for better seed mixes for logging rehab on the Fernow Experimental Forest.</p>
<p>P7 A management plan -- appropriate to the scale and intensity of the operations -- shall be written, implemented, and kept up to date. The long-term objectives of management, and the means of achieving them, shall be clearly stated.</p>		
<p>C7.1. The management plan and supporting documents shall provide: a) Management objectives. b) description of the forest resources to be managed, environmental limitations, land use and ownership status, socio-economic conditions, and a profile of adjacent lands. c) Description of silvicultural and/or other management system, based on the ecology of the forest in question and information gathered through resource inventories. d) Rationale for rate of annual harvest and species selection. e) Provisions for monitoring of forest growth and dynamics. f) Environmental safeguards based on environmental assessments. g) Plans for the identification and protection of rare, threatened and endangered species. h) Maps describing the forest resource base including protected areas, planned management activities and land ownership. i) Description and justification of harvesting techniques and equipment to be used.</p>	<p>C</p>	<p>The audit team has found adequate overall conformity with this Criterion.</p> <p>Management plans reviewed as part of this audit include the "5-year" plans for Vinton Furnace, Zaleski, Shawnee, Hocking, and Beaver Creek, as well as individual harvest plans for all timber sales visited during the audit, and updates to the land management manual, desired future condition document, and other documents that together form the management planning for the Ohio State Forests. The reviews focused on the gaps found during last year's full evaluation, as in most cases significant changes to the planning documents had been undertaken.</p> <p>Minor CAR 2010.6 was closed: Management plans do not adequately describe and justify the types and sizes of harvesting machinery and harvesting techniques employed on the FMU. DOF responded that amendments had been made to the management plans. A review of the sample of the five year management plans prepared for each 5-year forest confirmed that there is a section that describes harvesting equipment (Beaver Creek and Zaleski).</p> <p>OBS 2010.10 was closed: Conformity to the requirement that there be a description of the history of land use, past management, current conditions, desired future conditions and applicable management objectives (and other topics mentioned in Indicators 7.1.b&c) would be enhanced by more property-specific content within the management plans. DOF made specific updates to the management plans in response to this observation. While the plans still contain large amounts of text that are applicable to Ohio forests at a landscape level, there has been enhancement to some of the plans to add more local context to them, in particular the Shawnee State Forest management plan, which describes specific land use history such as the activities of the Civilian Conservation Corps in the 30s and the more recent ice storm of 2003.</p>
<p>C7.2. The management plan shall be periodically revised to incorporate the results of monitoring or new scientific</p>	<p>C</p>	<p>The audit team has found adequate overall conformity with this Criterion.</p>

<p>and technical information, as well as to respond to changing environmental, social and economic circumstances.</p>		<p>OBS 2010.11 was issued, recommending that the plans explicitly state that they be revised no longer than every 10 years. DOF revised 5-year plans to include a statement that plans will be revised every 5 years.</p> <p>No plan was reviewed that had not been updated in the past 10 years, as required by the indicator.</p>
<p>C7.3. Forest workers shall receive adequate training and supervision to ensure proper implementation of the management plans.</p>	<p>C</p>	<p>The audit team has found adequate overall conformity with this Criterion.</p> <p>Training of staff foresters on specific issues occurred throughout the year, such as new retention tree guidelines and SMZ implementation.</p> <p>OBS 2010.12 was closed: Employees of contractors are a weaker aspect of ODOF's training policies and procedures, constituting an opportunity for improvement. DOF responded that they encourage employees of contractors to complete the Master Logger Training program. In cases of poor performance by logging contractors, DOF has required their additional employees to receive Master logger training.</p> <p>OBS 2011.1 was issued. Interviews with new forester Dale Egbert did not show systematic implementation of an approach for training new staff. Dale himself is an experienced forester (only new to DOF) so training is less crucial. However it did reveal an opportunity to improve DOF's training efforts. Procedures for ensuring that new employees receive adequate training could be improved to ensure proper implementation of the management plan.</p>
<p>C7.4. While respecting the confidentiality of information, forest managers shall make publicly available a summary of the primary elements of the management plan, including those listed in Criterion 7.1.</p>	<p>C</p>	<p>The audit team has found adequate overall conformity with this Criterion.</p> <p>The entire management plan is publicly available. Minor CAR 2010.7 was closed. The land management manual, a central part of the overall management/planning system for the state forests, was not easily available to the public. DOF remedied this by adding the manual to the DNR website.</p>
<p>P8 Monitoring shall be conducted -- appropriate to the scale and intensity of forest management -- to assess the condition of the forest, yields of forest products, chain of custody, management activities and their social and environmental impacts.</p> <p><i>Applicability Note: On small and medium-sized forests (see Glossary), an informal, qualitative assessment may be appropriate. Formal, quantitative monitoring is required on large forests and/or intensively managed forests.</i></p>		
<p>C8.1. The frequency and intensity of monitoring should be determined by the scale and intensity of forest</p>	<p>C</p>	<p>The audit team has found adequate overall conformity with this Criterion.</p>

<p>management operations, as well as, the relative complexity and fragility of the affected environment. Monitoring procedures should be consistent and replicable over time to allow comparison of results and assessment of change.</p>		<p>A comprehensive summary of DOF's monitoring activities is contained in the Land Management Manual</p>
<p>8.2. Forest management should include the research and data collection needed to monitor, at a minimum, the following indicators: a) yield of all forest products harvested, b) growth rates, regeneration, and condition of the forest, c) composition and observed changes in the flora and fauna, d) environmental and social impacts of harvesting and other operations, and e) cost, productivity, and efficiency of forest management.</p>	<p>C</p>	<p>The audit team has found adequate overall conformity with this Criterion.</p> <p>Monitoring efforts include the compartment review process, GIS analysis, G&Y, logging inspections, forest health monitoring, and program reports. DOF also supports a variety of ongoing specialized research and monitoring activities at Vinton Furnace State Experimental Forest. Examples include migratory bird monitoring, and mammal and amphibian research projects. Stakeholder comments on DOF management are monitored primarily through open houses and tracking of comments.</p> <p>Minor CAR 2010.8 was closed: "With input from the scientific community, design and implement improved and more structured post-treatment evaluation procedures for assessing the effectiveness of prescribed fire treatments in achieving desired forest cover conditions." A new monitoring procedure was designed in response to this CAR, including input from outside scientists. Pre-fire monitoring is accomplished as part of the normal timber inventory. Post-fire monitoring is 3-5 years after, and considers overstory/mid/understory tree composition, with the aim to enhance oak regeneration. Also covered in the monitoring are any rte species on the site and the presence of invasives. Since this is a new program, monitoring data was not reviewed by the audit team, but should be done in future surveillance audits.</p> <p>Minor CAR 2010.9 was closed: "Take actions that will assure a higher and more consistent level of implementation of the road system monitoring procedures." The new road use procedures and inspection forms were reviewed. The forms are to be used on the limited use roads found in the state forests, such as bridle trails, timber hauling roads, and other roads not open for public use.</p> <p>One completed record of the road monitoring inspection sheet was reviewed (for Blackburn ridge). As the forms were still new at the time of the audit,</p>

<p>C8.3. Documentation shall be provided by the forest manager to enable monitoring and certifying organizations to trace each forest product from its origin, a process known as the "chain of custody."</p>	<p>C</p>	<p>this was the only record available.</p> <p>The audit team has found adequate overall conformity with this Criterion.</p> <p>Minor CAR 2010.11 was closed: Extend the stump to gate chain-of-custody procedures to cover stumpage sales. DOF updated Chapter 12 of the Land Management Manual to include stump-to-gate chain-of-custody procedures for stumpage timber sales.</p> <p>Timber sale agreements executed after certification was issued in January 2011 were reviewed, and did contain required language stating the FSC status of the certified material. (Agreement 1122 reviewed, Shawnee State Forest).</p>
<p>P9 Management activities in high conservation value forests shall maintain or enhance the attributes which define such forests. Decisions regarding high conservation value forests shall always be considered in the context of a precautionary approach.</p> <p>High Conservation Value Forests are those that possess one or more of the following attributes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Forest areas containing globally, regionally or nationally significant: concentrations of biodiversity values (e.g., endemism, endangered species, refugia); and/or large landscape level forests, contained within, or containing the management unit, where viable populations of most if not all naturally occurring species exist in natural patterns of distribution and abundance b) Forest areas that are in or contain rare, threatened or endangered ecosystems c) Forest areas that provide basic services of nature in critical situations (e.g., watershed protection, erosion control) d) Forest areas fundamental to meeting basic needs of local communities (e.g., subsistence, health) and/or critical to local communities' traditional cultural identity (areas of cultural, ecological, economic or religious significance identified in cooperation with such local communities). <p>Examples of forest areas that <i>may have</i> high conservation value attributes include, but are not limited to:</p> <p>Central Hardwoods:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Old growth – (see Glossary) (a) • Old forests/mixed age stands that include trees >160 years old (a) • Municipal watersheds –headwaters, reservoirs (c) • Rare, Threatened, and Endangered (RTE) ecosystems, as defined by GAP analysis, Natural Heritage Inventory, and/or the World Wildlife Fund's Forest Communities of Highest Conservation Concern, and/or Great Lakes Assessment (b) • Intact forest blocks in an agriculturally dominated landscape (refugia) (a) • Intact forests >1000 ac (valuable to interior forest species) (a) • Protected caves (a, b, or d) • Savannas (a, b, c, or d) • Glades (a, b, or d) • Barrens (a, b, or d) • Prairie remnants (a, b, or d) <p>North Woods/Lake States:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Old growth – (see Glossary) (a) • Old forests/mixed age stands that include trees >120 years old (a) • Blocks of contiguous forest, > 500 ac, which host RTEs (b) • Oak savannas (b) 		

- Hemlock-dominated forests (b)
- Pine stands of natural origin (b)
- Contiguous blocks, >500 ac, of late successional species, that are managed to create old growth (a)
- Fens, particularly calcareous fens (c)
- Other non-forest communities, e.g., barrens, prairies, distinctive geological land forms, vernal pools (b or c)
- Other sites as defined by GAP analysis, Natural Heritage Inventory, and/or the World Wildlife Fund’s Forest Communities of Highest Conservation Concern (b)

Note: In the Lake States-Central Hardwoods region, old growth (see Glossary) is both rare and invariably an HCVF.

In the Lake States-Central Hardwoods region, cutting timber is not permitted in old-growth stands or forests.

Note: Old forests (see Glossary) may or may not be designated HCVFs. They are managed to maintain or recruit: (1) the existing abundance of old trees and (2) the landscape- and stand-level structures of old-growth forests, consistent with the composition and structures produced by natural processes.

Old forests that either have or are developing old-growth attributes, but which have been previously harvested, may be designated HCVFs and may be harvested under special plans that account for the ecological attributes that make it an HCVF.

Forest management maintains a mix of sub-climax and climax old-forest conditions in the landscape.

<p>C9.1. Assessment to determine the presence of the attributes consistent with High Conservation Value Forests will be completed, appropriate to scale and intensity of forest management.</p>	<p>C</p>	<p>The audit team has found adequate overall conformity with this Criterion.</p> <p>An HCVF assessment was conducted in preparation for the 2010 initial evaluation. In brief, the assessment was conducted based on data from the heritage database (since renamed the Ohio Biodiversity database). Areas where identified based on concentrations of hits in the database, and were reviewed with stakeholders.</p> <p>Minor CAR 2010.10 was closed: Prepare and make readily available to the public a summary of the assessment results for identifying areas possessing high conservation values and the management strategies employed for maintaining or enhancing those values. The audit team confirmed that the HCVF assessment document was available on the ODNR website, describing the process for analyzing HCVF and the results of the analysis.</p>
<p>C9.4. Annual monitoring shall be conducted to assess the effectiveness of the measures employed to maintain or enhance the applicable conservation attributes.</p>	<p>C</p>	<p>The audit team has found adequate overall conformity with this Criterion.</p> <p>Major CAR 2010.1 had been issued as part of the initial evaluation, and closed prior to certification. ODNR had not yet developed and begun to implement a program to annually monitor the status of specific HCV attributes including the effectiveness of the measures employed for their maintenance or enhancement. A</p>

	<p>plan for addressing this CAR was developed, including creating an HCVF monitoring protocol as part of the Chapter 12 in the Land Management Manual. In general there is a five year cycle for rotating through each HCVF area. All areas are considered reserved from active management, except for controlling invasive species. Results of initial monitoring were reviewed (conducted by a DOW botanist). In at least one case, monitoring of HCVF has resulted in changes to management planning (the presence of a Hermit Thrush led to a removal of the associated habitat from the harvest area).</p>
--	---

Appendix 8 – Chain of Custody Indicators for FMEs (CONFIDENTIAL)

The SCS’ Chain of Custody (COC) indicators for Forest Management Enterprises (FMEs) were not reviewed during this audit. No nonconformities in the FME’s implementation of COC procedures and use of FSC trademarks were discovered during the audit. Furthermore, SCS has not received any complaints from FSC representatives or FME’s customers regarding trademark infringement and lapses in the implementation of COC procedures.